

The Miracle of St. George, the Princess, and the Dragon

Comparison of the Old Georgian and the Nearest Latin and Greek Versions

KEVIN TUIITE

Although the story of St. George rescuing a princess from a dragon is one of the most popular legends from medieval Christian hagiography, the earliest stages of its creation and diffusion remain obscure. Here is a summary of the miracle narrative as it appears in the oldest versions:

In the city of Lasia, there lived a king or emperor named Selinos or Selbios, who was an unbeliever and persecutor of Christians. God caused a dragon to appear in a nearby lake, which ate the people of the city. In desperation, the king asked each inhabitant to sacrifice a child to the dragon, and he as well would offer his only-begotten daughter. When the king's turn came, he offered all his wealth for his daughter's life, but the inhabitants refused, and she was sent off to the lake.

At this time, St. George came by on his way back from service in Diocletian's army, and saw the woman. She urged him to flee and save himself, but he refused. After the woman told him about herself and the people of the city and the gods they worshiped, George prayed to God to perform a miracle through him and subdue the dragon. A voice from heaven granted his request. Suddenly, the reeds shook and the dragon came out. George rushed toward it and made the sign of the cross. The dragon fell at his feet. George asked the woman to remove her

belt. He tied it around the dragon, handed it to her, and told her to go to the city.

On seeing the dragon, the people wanted to flee, but George told them to stay and witness the saving power of God. He asked them to believe in Christ. The king and all the people professed their faith in the Holy Trinity, after which George slew the dragon with his sword, and handed the woman back to her father. George sent for the bishop Alexander, who baptized the king and the people, forty-five thousand in all. They built a temple in honor of the saint. George entered it and made a spring with healing waters appear in the sanctuary. After performing other wonders, St. George left the city.

In the century following the beginning of the First Crusade, the princess-and-dragon miracle (henceforth PDM) appeared in Greek and Latin manuscripts, and the legend was depicted in frescoes in what is now northern Russia (Staraya Ladoga), in several churches throughout Georgia, and on an icon conserved at St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai.¹ By the fourteenth century, the PDM legend had spread throughout Europe, both as text and image, especially after its

¹ See E. L. Privalova, *Pavnisi* (Tbilisi, 1977); and K. Weitzmann, *The Icon: Holy Images—Sixth to Fourteenth Century* (New York, 1978).

incorporation into the celebrated *Legenda aurea* collection of Jacobus de Voragine.

While the Crusades doubtlessly contributed to the spread of the PDM (and, more generally, the cult of St. George as patron and protector of Christian warriors), the origin of the PDM predates the arrival of the first crusaders in the Holy Land. Well over a century ago, scholars in the Russian Empire argued that the source of the PDM lay further east, and identified Georgia and its adjacent regions, at the interface between the Byzantine and Iranian cultural domains, as the likely site where ancient Near Eastern motifs of a hero slaying a monstrous serpent were incorporated into the hagiographies of Christian military saints, St. George in particular.²

2 See A. N. Veselovskij, *Razyskanija v oblasti russkix duxovnyx stixov, II. Sv. Georgij v legende, pesne i obrjade* (St. Petersburg, 1880), 50–73; A. V. Rystencko, *Legenda o Sv. Georgii i Drakone v vizantijskoj i slavjanorusskoj literaturax* (Odessa, 1909), 456–74; and S. Kuehn, “The Dragon Fighter: The Influence of Zoroastrian Ideas on Judaeo-Christian and Islamic Iconography,” *ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies* 26.1 (2014): 59–92, esp. 73. The image of a horseman fighting a serpent or dragon is well-attested in the Iranian cultural area. Similar motifs are attested in Indic, Anatolian, and other Eurasian traditions; see V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov, *Issledovanie v oblasti slavjanskix drevnostej: Voprosy rekonstruktsii tekstov* (Moscow, 1974), 136–64; J. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins* (Berkeley, 1980), 515–20; C. Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York, 1995), 297–300; S. Kuehn, *The Dragon in Medieval East Christian and Islamic Art* (Leiden, 2011); A. Aarne, *The Types of the Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography*, trans. S. Thompson, 2nd rev. ed. (Helsinki, 1961), no. 300; V. N. Basilov, “Aždaxa,” in *Mify narodov mira*, ed. S. Tokarev (Moscow, 1991), 49–50; P. O. Skjærvø et al., “Aždahā,” *Encyclopedia Iranica Online*, <https://referenceworks.brill.com/display/entries/EIRO/COM-6197.xml>; and M. Witzel, “Slaying the Dragon across Eurasia,” in *In Hot Pursuit of Language in Prehistory: Essays in the Four Fields of Anthropology; In Honor of Harold Crane Fleming*, ed. J. D. Bengtson (Amsterdam, 2008), 263–86. The figures of St. George and the princess as co-participants in the subjugation of the dragon, with the princess playing a subordinate role, might also have drawn upon representations of male and female divine patrons of hunters and game animals in indigenous South Caucasian belief systems; see G. Charachidzé, *Le système religieux de la Géorgie païenne: Analyse structurale d’une civilisation* (Paris, 1968); K. Tuite, “The Meaning of Dael: Symbolic and Spatial Associations of the South Caucasian Goddess of Game Animals,” in *Language, Culture and the Individual: A Tribute to Paul Friedrich*, ed. C. O’Neil, M. Scoggin, and K. Tuite (Munich, 2006), 165–88; K. Tuite, “St. George in the Caucasus: Politics, Gender, Mobility,” in *Sakralität und Mobilität im Kaukasus und in Südosteuropa*, ed. T. Darieva, T. Kahl, and S. Toncheva (Vienna, 2017), 21–56; and N. Aleksidze, *Sanctity, Gender and Authority in Medieval Caucasia* (Edinburgh, 2024), 161–65.

Also at this time, the earliest known appearance of the PDM was identified in the codex Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate, Georg. 2 (JG2), probably written at the Georgian monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem in the latter half of the eleventh century and now held in the library of the Greek Patriarchate of that city.³ Although the codex was described as early as the 1880s, it was not until nearly a century later, after the art historian Ekaterina Privalova published a Russian summary of the PDM narrative in JG2, that this text came to the notice of the wider scholarly community.⁴

The objective of this article is to support the hypothesis of the Georgian origin of the narrative of George, the princess, and the dragon through comparison of the earliest textual and iconographic witnesses of this narrative. I will argue that certain otherwise unmotivated variant readings in Latin and Greek witnesses of the PDM can be accounted for by postulating an antecedent text close to the Georgian tradition. Furthermore, it appears that what was to become a standard iconographic representation of the PDM likewise originated in a Georgian milieu, whence it spread westward and northward. A tentative reconstruction of the oldest recoverable form of the PDM narrative is presented in Part 2 of the Appendix to this article, juxtaposed to the Georgian texts from two manuscripts, JG2 and Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate, Georg. 37 (JG37).

3 A. Cagareli, “Pamjatniki gruzinskoj stariny v Svjatoj Zemle i na Sinae,” *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik* 10 (1888): 172; N. J. Marr, *Žitie Sv. Grigorija Xandzijskago* (St. Petersburg, 1911); R. P. Blake, “Catalogue des manuscrits géorgiens de la Bibliothèque patriarcale grecque à Jérusalem,” *ROC* 23.3/4 (1922–1923): 345–413, at 357–62; and K. Tuite, “The Old Georgian Version of the Miracle of St George, the Princess and the Dragon: Text, Commentary and Translation,” in *Sharing Myths, Texts and Sanctuaries in the South Caucasus: Apocryphal Themes in Literatures, Arts and Cults from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, ed. I. Dorfmann-Lazarev (Leuven, 2022), 60–94.

4 Privalova, *Pavnisi*; see, e.g., C. Walter, “The Origins of the Cult of Saint George,” *REB* 53 (1995): 295–326; and P. L. Grotowski, *Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography (843–1261)* (Leiden, 2010). Walter’s article includes a translation of Privalova’s summary, which was picked up by other scholars, among them Kuehn (*Dragon*, 109), J. Johns (“Muslim Artists and Christian Models in the Painted Ceilings of the Cappella Palatina,” in *Romanesque and the Mediterranean: Points of Contact across the Latin, Greek and Islamic Worlds, c. 1000 to c. 1250*, ed. R. M. Bacile and J. McNeill [Leeds, 2015], 59–89), and D. Ogden (*The Dragon in the West: From Ancient Myth to Modern Legend* [Oxford, 2021], 297–302).

Collation of Georgian, Latin, and Greek Versions

When comparing the oldest Georgian, Latin, and Greek manuscripts of the PDM, one finds a number of points of divergence, some more significant than others. In what follows, key differences among these versions of the PDM will be presented section-by-section⁵ with an eye toward (tentatively) establishing the oldest form of the narrative and, in doing so, establishing that the Georgian manuscripts are closest to this oldest form.

The principal witnesses of the PDM to be compared in this study are listed in Table 1.1, along with the abbreviations used to refer to them in the following discussion. A list of the other witnesses mentioned here is given in Table 1.2. Details about the manuscripts in which they appear, along with references to catalogue listings, published editions (if any), and other pertinent literature are provided in Part 1 of the Appendix.⁶

In the process of reconstruction, choices had to be made as to which features to ascribe to the ancestral text when the attested witnesses disagreed. The most significant cases of disagreement are discussed here, in the order of the section in which they occur (as numbered in the Part 2 of the Appendix).

Section 2

There are two major points of divergence between the Georgian texts and the Greek and Latin texts in section two. First of all, JG2 and the other Georgian versions situate the PDM at the time when “the saint was shining upon the land, before his martyrdom.”⁷ The same verb root (*brc’q’in-*) is also employed to characterize George in some of the narratives of his martyrdom; for example, “then George the saint of God **shone forth** [გამობრწყინდა] like a brilliant star on a dark night.”⁸ This passage finds a close parallel

in one of the Greek martyrdom texts: “at that time he **shone forth** [ἀνέλαμψεν] like a bright star on a moonless night.”⁹ Comparisons of George to a shining star occur elsewhere in the Greek martyrdom narratives.¹⁰ The transfer of the luminosity trope to the PDM narrative, however, is limited to the Georgian tradition. The accounts of this miracle in other languages, as far as I know, simply specify at most that it happened during his lifetime, without any mention of “shining.” It seems likely, then, that this was an innovation on the original narrative within the Georgian tradition.

Second, the name of the king is Selinos (სელინოს) in all Georgian texts. Most early Greek and Latin witnesses give forms of the name lacking the consonant /n/, usually with a /b/ or /u/ in its place, e.g., Σέλβιος (Seluius).¹¹ There is no obvious historical or legendary personage from whom any of the latter variants could have been adopted.¹² The name Selinos, on the other hand, does appear elsewhere, in the martyrdom narrative of St. Febronia (Φεβρωνία, ფებრონიკია), a nun from Nisibis (now near the Syrian border in southeast Turkey) who lived at the time of the emperor Diocletian. According to her vita, Febronia was tortured and beheaded in 304 CE at the orders of a Roman official named Selinos or Selēnos (Σελίνος/Σελήνος), who had been sent by Diocletian to the eastern provinces to suppress the Christian communities there.¹³ By the eleventh century, the story of her martyrdom had appeared in several Georgian manuscripts, including the synaxarion of George the Athonite, a copy of which is held in the Patriarchal Library of Jerusalem (Jerusalem, Patriarchal

5 The section numbers refer to divisions of the PDM text as shown in the first and second columns in Part 2 of the Appendix.

6 Early witnesses of the PDM also appeared in Church Slavonic. The texts in thirteenth- to sixteenth-century manuscripts collated by Rystenka (*Legenda o Sv. Georgii*) are all closer to the Greek than to the Georgian, and are not included in this study.

7 ვიდრეღა ბრწყინვიდა ქვეყანასა ზედა წმიდა იგი პირველ წამებისა მისისა.

8 მაშინ გამობრწყინდა წმიდაჲ ღმრთისაჲ გიორგი ვითარცა ვარსკულავი ბრწყინვალჲ ღამესა შინა ბნელსა (E. Gabidzashvili, *C'minda giorgi dzvel kartul mc'erlobaši* [Tbilisi, 1991], 46).

9 Vienna, Austrian National Library, Theol. gr. 123, fols. 37v–43v, thirteenth century: τηνικαῦτα ἀνέλαμψεν ὡς ἐν σκοτομήνῃ νυκτὸς ἀστὴρ διαφανής (K. Krumbacher, *Der heilige Georg in der griechischen Überlieferung* [Munich, 1911], 32; and Veselovskij, *Razyskanija*, 175).

10 See, e.g., Krumbacher, *Der heilige Georg*, 3, 215, 244.

11 The exceptions are the Latin manuscripts DD, in which the king is named Senius, and the *Legenda aurea*, in which the city (not its king, who is unnamed) is called Silena (Veselovskij, *Razyskanija*, 73; and J. Aufhauser, *Das Drachenwunder des Heiligen Georg in der griechischen und lateinischen Überlieferung* [Leipzig, 1911], 203).

12 After reviewing the half-dozen spellings of the king's name in his corpus, Aufhauser came to the conclusion that in all likelihood the name of the king, like that of the city Lasia, was a product of “der schöpferischen Phantaisie des ersten Verfassers des Drachenwunders” (*Drachenwunder*, 75–76).

13 S. P. Brock and S. A. Harvey, *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient* (Berkeley, 1987).

Table 1.1. Principal Witnesses of the PDM Used in This Study

	Language	Date	Manuscript	Reference
JG2	Georgian	eleventh century	Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Georg. 2	Blake, "Catalogue," 357–62
JG37	Georgian	thirteenth to sixteenth century	Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Georg. 37	Blake, "Catalogue," 194–98
AA	Latin	twelfth century	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, lat. 6933	Poncelet, <i>Catalogus</i> , 196–98
BB	Latin	twelfth century	Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, lat. 739 (ex Vindob. lat. 15)	<i>BHL</i> 3396k
CC	Latin	twelfth century	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 14473	Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 179–87
DD	Latin	ca. 1300	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Arch. Capit. S. Pietro C129	Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 218–26
LA	Latin	1282	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 13029	<i>Legenda aurea</i> ; and Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 195–212
F	Greek	sixteenth century	Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, II 160	Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 36
G	Greek	1542	Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, gr. 1190	Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 36–37
U	Greek	sixteenth century	Athens, National Library of Greece, 838	Aufhauser, <i>Drachenwunder</i> , 43
Ξ	Greek	1308	Messina, Biblioteca Regional Universitaria, gr. 29	Ehrhard, <i>Überlieferung</i> , 3:443–50
Υ	Greek	fifteenth century	Meteores, Metamorphōseōs 382	Ehrhard, <i>Überlieferung</i> , 3:767–68

Table 1.2. Secondary Greek Witnesses of the PDM Used in This Study

	Date	Manuscript
A	1315	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 770
H	sixteenth century	Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, VII 38
L	fifteenth century	Athens, National Library of Greece, 278
Z	twelfth century	Vatican, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 46
Γ	nineteenth century	Mt. Athos, Panteleimon, 161
Δ	nineteenth century	Mt. Athos, Panteleimon, 90
Θ	sixteenth century	Istanbul, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Theologikē skholē 39
Π	fifteenth century	Istanbul, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Panaghia 128
Φ	thirteenth century	Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, II 42

Library, Jer. Georg. 25).¹⁴ The hegemon Selinos, whose sadistic treatment of Febronia is described in gruesome detail, is in all respects—characterological, chronological, and geographical—a close match with King Selinos of Lasia.¹⁵ In this case, then, it seems that the Georgian version retains the original form of the king's name, whereas in most other witnesses the name has undergone a degree of orthographic deformation.¹⁶

Section 16

In all the Greek and Latin versions of the PDM, the king's lyrical lament includes a series of seven or eight rhetorical questions concerning preparations for a wedding he fears will never take place and a grandchild he will never see. On the other hand, in all of the Georgian witnesses, the series of questions is condensed into a single sentence ("When will I prepare instruments and dancers and lamps and drinkers and banqueters for you?"), with the sequence of the elements somewhat altered.¹⁷ In this case, I believe the Greek and Latin witnesses are closer to the original form of the PDM,

14 See J. Simon, "Note sur l'original de la Passion de Sainte Fébronie," *AB* 42 (1924): 69–76; J. Gippert and B. Outtier, "The Oldest Georgian Psalter – A Preliminary Account," *Mravaltavi: Philological and Historical Researches* 27 (2021): 41–65; and M. Kamarauli, "Digital Methods of Comparative Manuscript Research: The Martyrdom of St. Febronia," *Millennium* 2 (forthcoming).

15 The source of the Selinos character in the hagiography of St. Febronia is a distinct question. For an interesting hypothesis concerning Selinos/Selénos and other proper names in the Febronia narrative, see A. Busine, "The Dux and the Nun: Hagiography and the Cult of Artemios and Febronia in Constantinople," *DOP* 72 (2018): 93–112. It could also be the case that Febronia's tormentor and the king of Lasia were both based on a now lost tradition associated with a Diocletian-era persecutor of Christians.

16 While it is highly unlikely that we will ever be able to identify the point when this error occurred, a far more recent instance gives some idea of how such a misreading might have happened. In his description of codex Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, lat. 6933 (our AA), A. Poncelet (*Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae* [Brussels, 1910], 198) transcribes the second sentence of the PDM narrative as *In qua erat imperator quidam, nomine Selinus*. This would be extraordinary if true. Close inspection of the image of the passage available online, however, reveals the spelling as *Seliuius* (likewise in P. M. Huber, *Johannes Monachus: Liber de Miraculis* [Heidelberg, 1913], 128), but also how easy it could have been to misread the letter sequence <ui> as <in>, especially in an unfamiliar proper name.

17 Also specific to the Georgian corpus is the phrase "I will never again see your face" (არღარა ვიხილო პირი შენი).

whereas this passage underwent reduction in the common ancestor of the Georgian versions.

Section 22

The next difference to be discussed concerns George's dismissal from Diocletian's army. In the Georgian versions, the clause describing his dismissal is subordinated to the verb განაგო (set in order, arranged) with "God" as the implied subject, giving the reading "[God] made it happen, that King Deoclitian [*sic*]¹⁸ released [George] from the army." No such explicit reference to divine intervention occurs in this section in the Greek and Latin versions. At present I see no grounds for favoring one or the other reading, though it is possible the Georgian is innovative here.

Section 27

In section 27, in all versions except those in Georgian, the princess implores George to mount his horse and get away. The Georgian versions have no mention of the horse, but rather the command "go from here, and flee quickly!" Taking into account the preceding mention of the horse, and the redundancy of the first part of the Georgian passage, I consider it likely that the Greek and Latin versions continue the original reading.

Section 28

In section 28, we see a peculiar vocabulary choice in the older Georgian versions of the PDM. George asks the princess two questions after being told to flee; in both questions, the interrogative pronoun used is რად (what), even though Georgian has a distinct pronoun with human reference ვინ (who).¹⁹ The use of the inanimate pronoun in this context is very rare in Old Georgian. In the few attested occurrences, the question რად ხარ (What are you?) seems to express the speaker's

18 In all of the Old Georgian witnesses of the PDM, the name of the emperor is written დეოკლიტიანე, with metathesis of the first and third vowels. This (mis)spelling is attested sporadically in medieval Georgian hagiographic texts, including the martyrdom of Febronia, mentioned above, and also appears on the celebrated eleventh-century icon of St. George in Nak'ipari, Svaneti (E. Takaichvili [Taq'aishvili], *Arkeologiuri eksp'edicia lecxum-svanetši 1910 c'els / Expédition archéologique en Letchkhoulm et en Svanéthie* [Paris, 1937], 237; and G. N. Chubinashvili, *Gruzinskoe čekannoe iskusstvo*, 2 vols. [Tbilisi, 1959], 1:358–59, 2:no. 184).

19 Georgian lacks the category of grammatical gender, but certain verb stems and pronominals are sensitive to animacy or humanness.

uncertainty about the human or supernatural nature of the referent or bewilderment on the part of pagan rulers interrogating Christian martyrs.²⁰ The equivalent expressions (τί εἶ, *quid es*) are attested, albeit rarely, in Greek and Latin,²¹ but do not appear in any known witnesses of the PDM in those languages. On balance, this suggests that the inanimate interrogative pronoun is the original reading continued in the Georgian tradition.

Section 36b

When reading Greek versions of the PDM, we see combined biblical references not present in the Georgian versions. Following further dialogue between the princess and George, the latter raises his eyes to God, and in a prayer larded with scriptural quotes, ascribes to God the knowledge of people's thoughts or hearts. The Georgian version of this passage²² echoes Luke 9:47 ("but Jesus knew **the thoughts of their hearts** [გულის ზრახვანი]"). However, almost all of the Greek versions, with the exception of Ψ, add to the word meaning "hearts" or "thoughts" the phrase "that are vain" (ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι), which seems to reference Psalms 93:11 ("The Lord knoweth the thoughts of men, that they are vain"). The hypothesis that Psalms 93:11 was the initial biblical source for section 36b runs up against the references to καρδιά (heart) or even καρδιογνώστα (heart-knower) in ten of the eighteen Greek manuscripts in the corpus, all of which also include the qualifier μάταιοι (vain).²³ In order to account for these hybrid references, I postulate an initial citation based on Luke 9:47, to which "of men" was added. The references to "thoughts" (διαλογισμούς, *cogitationes*) could have evoked, in the mind of a later copyist, the verse in Psalms 93, which employs the same words in both its Greek and Vulgate versions. This would have resulted in a hybrid phrase of the form "you know the thoughts of the hearts of men, that they are vain." Garbled versions

of this phrase appear in several Greek manuscripts, including G and H.²⁴ In G and four other witnesses, the word καρδιά has been replaced by καρδιογνώστα, presumably inspired by Acts 1:24, which refers to God as a "heart-knower." Elsewhere, reference to heart(s) has been lost, in all likelihood due to scribes who believed they recognized a reference to Psalms 93:11, and "corrected" the text accordingly. The original form of the PDM, therefore, likely contained only the allusion to Luke 9:47, as is most closely reflected in the early Georgian manuscripts.

Sections 38a and 41

A strange combination of items appears in Greek and Latin versions of the PDM that is absent in the Georgian versions. To understand a possible reason for this change and its significance, we need to first examine a specific word choice in section 38a found in the Georgian versions. In nearly all of the Greek versions of the PDM, there is no text between the voice from heaven in section 37 and the princess's cry of alarm in section 38b, whereas in all Georgian versions, the imminent appearance of the dragon is announced by the shaking of the reedbed (λεγερῶμα) in the lake. A handful of Greek renderings (F, G, and Ψ) and nearly all of the Latin ones mention some kind of agitation in the lake, although only the Latin manuscript AA specifies a reedbed (*in arundineto*). In terms of word sequence, the passage in Ψ comes especially close to the Georgian, if the missing letters in the sequence καὶ παραχρήμα . . . θη ὁ λάκκος [*sic*] are filled in with the verb ἐταράχθη (was shaken, agitated), as suggested by Xavier Lequeux,²⁵ to give the reading "and suddenly the lake was agitated."²⁶

The mention of the reedbed could help us understand the odd pair of items that, according to nearly all of the Greek and two of the Latin versions of the PDM, were used to fashion a leash for the dragon.²⁷ In section 41, after subduing the dragon, George orders the princess to remove her belt (λύσον τὴν ζώνην σου)

20 As in the *Martyrdom of St. Elian*: "Maximos asked him: 'What are you or who are you [რაჲ ხარ შენ ანუ ვინაჲ ხარ]?' Elian said to him, 'I am a servant of Christ'" (K. Kekelidze, ed., *Kartuli agiografiuli dzegebi I. k'imeni*, vol. 2 [Tbilisi, 1946], 34).

21 E.g., Augustine, *Sermon* 92:4; and 2 Kings 9:32 (LXX, Antiochian recension); see A. Lemaire and B. Halpern, eds., *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception* (Leiden, 2010), 46.

22 შენ თავადმან უწყნი გულის ზრახვანი კაცთანი.

23 For an inventory of Greek witnesses containing these variant readings, see Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 63–64, 150.

24 G: γινώσκεις καρδιογνώστα τοὺς διαλογισμούς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι; H: γινώσκεις καρδίας καὶ λογισμούς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι.

25 X. Lequeux, pers. comm.

26 It should be noted that manuscripts F and G also use forms of this verb: τὸ ὕδωρ διεταράχθη (the water was shaken).

27 Tuite, *Old Georgian Version*, 73–75.

and “the cord of my horse” (τὸ σχοινίον τοῦ ἵππου μου), both of which he uses to bind the dragon. Of these two components, the belt is the most readily accounted for. As noted by Daniel Ogden, the legends of dragon-defeating saints frequently include the trope of an innocuous article of clothing, such as a kerchief, stole, or belt, used by the saint to bind the beast after its submission to divine power.²⁸ The horse cord seems out of place here, and a leash made of two elements tied together does not appear in any iconographic representation of this scene. The noun *σχοινίον* (cord, rope) is a derivative of *σχοῖνος* (reed, place full of reeds), these plants having been commonly used to make rope.²⁹ My hypothesis is that the occurrence of this word in section 41 resulted from a misreading or misspelling of *σχοῖνος* in the text being copied, where it was used to denote the shaking reedbed in section 38a. The original passage would have read *καὶ παραχρήμα ἐταράχθη ὁ σχοῖνος* (and suddenly the reedbed was shaken) or something similar.

The word *σχοινίον* would have been subsequently transplanted a few lines down to section 41, where reference to some kind of cord would seem appropriate. The existence of a witness such as the Latin manuscript AA, which includes mentions of both the reedbed and the “cords of the horse” (*funes equi*), could be accounted for by a source that was translated from a lost Greek original that retained *σχοῖνος* in section 38a even after *σχοινίον* was inserted into section 41, or else a text produced by a copyist who worked from two or more documents, one of which contained *σχοῖνος* (or its equivalent) and the other *σχοινίον*. Of the texts in the corpus, one Greek manuscript (G) and three Latin manuscripts (CC, DD, and LA) agree with the Georgian versions insofar as they mention an event in the water signaling the arrival of the dragon and lack reference to any item besides the woman’s belt for binding the dragon. Overall, the movement from the mention of the reedbed in Georgian versions to the horse cord in many Greek and Latin versions suggests a source text of Georgian origin.

28 D. Ogden, *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Oxford, 2013), 403; D. Ogden, *Dragons, Serpents and Slayers in the Classical and Early Christian Worlds: A Sourcebook* (Oxford, 2013), xxiii; and Ogden, *Dragon in the West*, 197–200.

29 J. K. Aitken, “Σχοῖνος in the Septuagint,” *Vetus Testamentum* 50.4 (2000): 433–44.

Section 43

In this section, certain shared features in verb tense between the Georgian and some Greek/Latin versions of the PDM suggest a possible common ancestor. Upon seeing the dragon being led toward them by the princess, the people of Lasia take fright and try to flee. George tells them not to fear, but rather “stand and you will see God’s deliverance.”³⁰ This passage repeats almost verbatim the words of Moses before God parted the waters of the Red Sea in most Old Georgian versions of Exodus 14:13, as shown in Table 2.³¹ Whereas the first conjoined verb is in the second-person plural imperative, the second is in the future tense (იხილოთ [you (pl.) will see it]).

In the Septuagint and Vulgate renderings of Exodus 14:13, both verbs are in the imperative mood,³² as are the verbs in citations of this verse in nearly all Greek and Latin versions of the PDM. A handful of witnesses diverge from this pattern and, furthermore, follow the tense sequence that occurs in the Georgian witnesses. The Greek manuscript L, the nineteenth-century vernacular versions Γ and Δ, and the Latin BB employ the same sequence of second-person plural imperative followed by future as in the Georgian.³³ In view of the

30 დეგით და იხილოთ მაცხოვარებდა ღმრთისაჲ.

31 The oldest known Georgian versions of the book of Exodus with this reading are from the seventeenth century (Tbilisi, Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts, mss. A51, A179, H1207, and Kutaisi, Kutaisi Museum, 28), which implies that a translation ancestral to these manuscripts was in existence at least six centuries earlier. Confirming the early date of the translation is the use of the first-person object prefix /m/- with exclusive-plural meaning (რომელმაც ჩვენთვის [which he will do for us (excl.)]), a usage that was already in decline by the eleventh century.

32 *στήτε καὶ ὁράτε τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ / state et videte magnalia Domini.*

33 L: *στήκετε καὶ ὀψέσθε τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ θεοῦ μου*; ΓΔ: *καθήσατε καὶ θέλετε ἰδεῖ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ*; BB: *state et confidite et uidebitis Dei omnipotentis misericordiam*. The future-tense form also appears in the more verbose rendering of section 43 in manuscript CC (*virī, nolite timere, sed state confidenter, quia invocato trinitatis nomine videbitis miracula dei* [Men, do not fear, but stand confidently, for by invoking the name of the Trinity **you will see** the miracles of God]), although in view of the abundance of added material it is not obvious that the copyist relied on an original similar to BB for the choice of tense. This is also the case for the parallel passage in manuscript Θ, which includes the second-person plural future, but also intercalated material (*ὀψέσθε τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ* [(Do not fear, if you believe in the son of God,) **you will see** his power]).

Table 2. Tense Sequence in Citations of Exodus 14:13 in the PDM

	PDM, Section 43	Exodus 14:13
Georgian	დეგით და <u>ღებოლოთ</u> მაცხოვარებად ღმრთისად	დეგით და <u>ღებოლოთ</u> მაცხოვარება ღმრთისა, რომელ მიყოს ჩუენ დღესა მას [Tbilisi, Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts, H2107; and Kutaisi, Kutaisi Museum, 28]
Greek	Ξ: <u>στήκετε</u> καὶ <u>ὀρᾶτε</u> τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ θεοῦ L: <u>στήκετε</u> καὶ <u>ὄψεσθε</u> τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ θεοῦ μου	<u>στήτε</u> καὶ <u>ὀρᾶτε</u> τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν ποίησει ἡμῖν σήμερον [LXX]
Latin	AA: <u>state confidenter</u> et <u>uide</u> te misericordiam Dei omnipotentis BB: <u>state et confidite</u> et <u>uidebitis</u> Dei omnipotentis misericordiam	<u>state et videte</u> <u>magnalia Domini quae facturus est</u> <u>hodie</u> [Vulgate]

shared features pointing to a special proximity between the Old Georgian and earliest Latin textual traditions of the PDM (see below, Table 3), one wonders if the copyist of the Latin manuscript BB could have obtained *uidebitis* from a source, possibly in Greek, that in its turn had been translated from a Georgian original.

Even beyond section 43, we find uncommon parallels for the Greek manuscripts L, Γ, and Δ in the Georgian versions. For the Greek L, it is in most respects no closer to the Georgian tradition than the other manuscripts I have grouped together as “other Greek” in Table 3 below. It does, however, contain two parallels to the Georgian that do not occur in most other manuscripts: *εἰπέ μοι πάντα* (tell me all, მიიხარ ყოველივე), in section 30, and the number of forty-five thousand baptized, in section 47. The Greek vernacular manuscripts Γ and Δ, despite their very late dates and numerous modifications,³⁴ also share scattered parallels with the Georgian witnesses not found in most other Greek sources, among them the binding of the dragon with the woman’s belt only. The most likely explanation is that the Greek manuscripts L, Γ, and Δ descend from ancestral texts derived from two or more source documents, one of which shared these features with the Georgian corpus.³⁵

34 Aufhauser (*Drachenwunder*, 144) classifies Γ as a “rhetorisch erweiterter Text.”

35 Also of interest for the comparison of the PDM versions is the word expressing what it is that the people are to stand and see. All Georgian versions use the same word (მაცხოვარებად [salvation, deliverance]) as in the passage from Exodus. Several Greek versions (A, G, K, and Ξ) do likewise, employing *σωτηρίαν*. Many others, including some of those that in other respects stand close to the Georgian tradition, substitute *δόξαν* (glory) (Υ, U, T, W, and Z). The Latin manuscripts AA and BB employ *misericordiam* in this context, which appears to be an innovation specific to this pair of texts.

Passages from the PDM in some of the versions mentioned above are shown in Table 2, alongside the parallel verse in Exodus 14. Single underlines mark verbs in the imperative mood; double underlines mark verbs in the future tense.

Diagnostic Textual Divergences

Some of the differences among the Georgian, Greek, and Latin versions of the PDM story are readily apparent to the reader, such as the name of the king, whereas others—such as the tense sequence in section 43 just discussed—are less visible, but potentially of diagnostic importance.

Leaving aside the differences possibly resulting from innovations specific to the Georgian tradition (namely, in sections 16, 22, 27, and 28), four innovations can be identified that distinguish the Georgian corpus, along with some manuscripts in other languages, from the rest (namely, in sections 2, 36, 38, and 41). Of these, three involve the alteration or addition of a feature and one the loss of a narrative element. The status of the four innovations for the texts in the corpus is shown in Table 3.

As one can see, no Greek or Latin manuscripts match the features in the Georgian manuscripts entirely, though all do in some parts. The range is noteworthy: some manuscripts, like the Latin DD and LA, are fairly close to the Georgian, insofar as they show none of the innovations numbered 1–4 in Table 3. The Greek manuscripts U and Ξ attest all four innovations—the corrupted spelling of the king’s name in section 2; reference to a “horse’s cord” in section 41; the allusion to Psalms 93:11 in section 36; and no mention of a reedbed or water of any kind in section 38—although in other

Table 3. Comparison of Select Features in Georgian, Latin, and Greek Witnesses of the PDM

		Georgian	Latin					Closer Greek			Other Greek	
	Feature (section number)		LA	DD	CC	BB	AA	Ψ	U	Ξ	FG	Others
	16, 22, 27, and 28	+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1	2: Selinos to Selb-	Selinos	Silena	Senius	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2	41: σχοινίον	—	—	—	—	+	+	+	+	+	G- F+	+
3	36b: Luke 9 to Psalms 93:11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	+	+	+	+
4	38: agitation in reedbed	+	lacu	aquarum	aquarum	aqua	+	lakōs	Ø	Ø	hudōr	Ø

Note: A dash (—) indicates the feature is lacking and a plus sign (+) indicates that the feature is present; cells are shaded dark gray when they share the same traits as the Georgian manuscripts (hence none are shaded concerning sections 16, 22, 27, and 28, where the Georgian manuscripts are unique) and lightly shaded when they bear some similarities to the Georgian manuscripts. The group “other Greek” comprises nearly the entire set of manuscripts collated by Johannes Aufhauser. These witnesses are separated from the Georgian, Latin, and “closer Greek” texts by numerous divergences, at least a dozen, indicated in the table by the thick line.

respects they are closer to the Georgian than any of the “other Greek” witnesses of the PDM. Still, out of this wide variety, it is possible to draw together some relevant observations.

It is evident that the Latin texts as a group are closer to the Georgian than the Greek texts are. As shown by the shaded cells in the table, the proximity of the Latin tradition to the Georgian is one of conservation, not innovation. The Greek corpus on the whole is distinguished from the Georgian by the alteration of the name of the king, the addition of the “horse’s cord,” and the phrase “that are vain” from Psalms 93:11. The distribution of the first two traits among the Latin witnesses is likely to have resulted from textual hybridization at some point in the ancestry of these manuscripts. The mention of a cord in AA and BB could be traceable to a text ancestral to this group, which acquired this feature when a copyist worked from one original closer to the Greek tradition and another closer to the Georgian.

Although it creates headaches for those who like neatly branching cladograms in which each item has a single ancestor, hybridization or “contamination” is by no means unknown in textual traditions, and could well have been fairly common.³⁶ In fact, hybridization

seems the most reasonable explanation of the surprising parallels between the Georgian and manuscripts F and G, which form a subgroup within the “other Greek” group and which are otherwise quite distant from the Georgian, Latin, and “closer Greek” witnesses. This subgroup consists of the only Greek manuscripts (besides Ψ) that mention the disturbance of the waters before the dragon arrives, and G, along with the vernacular renderings Γ and Δ, is the only Greek version of the PDM that lacks reference to a σχοινίον or its equivalent in section 41.

The wide variety of words occupying the place of “reedbed” calls for some explanation (see number 4 in Table 3). One scenario that might account for this diversity is that, after the initial replacement of σχοινίον with σχοινίον, and its transposition to the episode of St. George putting a leash on the dragon, copyists either omitted the reference to agitation in section 38a or inserted a word denoting water or a body of water (*aqua*, *lacus*).

With respect to the original language of the PDM, the evidence is far from conclusive, but the study thus far has suggested that it may have been composed in Georgian, with the tense sequence in the citation of Exodus 14:13 as a particularly important piece of

36 P. Tomea (“San Giorgio in Crimea: Per una nuova edizione del *Liber notitiae sanctorum Mediolani* [con una nota sulla Papessa Giovanna],” *Aevum* 73.2 [1999]: 423–58) presents one such case of textual hybridization involving the account of the miracle of St. George

and the demon in the *Liber notitiae sanctorum Mediolani* (ca. 1300), which includes features drawn from at least two sources, one close to AA, the other CC.

evidence.³⁷ Scholars have identified one text that was almost certainly translated from Georgian into Greek: the eleventh-century *Barlaam and Ioasaph* (BHG 224), based a ninth-century Georgian text known as the *Balavariani*, which itself was translated from an Arabic source.³⁸ According to Nikoloz Aleksidze, the *Passion of Michael of Mar Saba* may have also been rendered into Greek from Georgian, though this has not been definitively proven.³⁹ The change from σχοῖνος to σχοινίον, discussed previously, would motivate a Georgian-to-Greek translation in the textual histories of those witnesses containing a reference to a “horse’s cord” in section 41.

At the same time, the particular closeness of the early Latin versions to the Georgian tradition raises the question of whether the PDM could have passed directly from a Georgian source into Latin. Recently, Caroline Macé and colleagues have hypothesized that the Latin version of the *Epistola ad Timotheum de morte apostolorum Petri et Pauli* “aus einer georgischen Vorlage übersetzt ist” in the second half of the twelfth century.⁴⁰

37 If the Septuagint can be ruled out as the source of the future-tense verb ὀνειδισσῶ in the Old Georgian readings of Exodus 14:13, the Armenian Old Testament remains a serious candidate. The Armenian rendering of this verse has exactly the same sequence of tenses as the Georgian: ლუგტბ ბი ონუაზიგტბ, the second verb being in the future. The appearance of a phrase or word attributable to an Armenian source is by no means unusual. The influence of Armenian texts on Old Georgian ecclesiastical writing is well documented, especially in manuscripts that were produced in the earliest periods of Georgian Christianity, before the split between the Georgian and Armenian churches over the Miaphysite question. See A. Vööbus, *Zur Geschichte des altgeorgischen Evangelientextes* (Stockholm, 1953), 28–31; A. Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies* (Stockholm, 1954), 173–209; Z. Sarjeladze et al., *Adišis otxtavi 897 c’lisa* (Tbilisi, 2003), 55–69, 117–18; and J. W. Childers, “The Bible in Georgian,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2, *From 600 to 1450*, ed. R. Marsden and E. A. Matter (Cambridge, 2012), 162–78.

38 See P. Peeters, “La première traduction latine de ‘Barlaam et Joasaph’ et son original grec,” *AB* 49 (1931): 276–312; D. M. Lang, “St. Euthymius the Georgian and the Barlaam and Ioasaph Romance,” *BSO[AS]* 17.2 (1955): 306–25; and D. M. Lang, “The Life of the Blessed Iodasaph: A New Oriental Christian Version of the Barlaam and Ioasaph Romance,” *BSO[AS]* 20.1/3 (1957): 389–407.

39 N. Aleksidze, “Section IV: Georgian,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*, ed. S. Papaioannou (New York, 2021), 219–26. See also P. Peeters, “La Passion de S. Michel le Sabaïte,” *AB* 48 (1930): 65–98.

40 C. Macé et al., eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 3, pt. 1, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita: Epistola ad Timotheum de morte apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (Berlin, 2021), 250; and C. Macé, “The *Epistola ad Timotheum de morte apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, Attributed to

At least one of the versions ancestral to the Latin DD and LA, which contain forms close to “Silenus” for the king’s name (or that of the city he ruled), and no mention of the “horse’s cord,” could have followed a similar pathway from Georgian to Latin, without passing through a Greek intermediary. It is therefore possible that the PDM could have been translated from Georgian on more than one occasion, into more than one language, giving rise to distinct textual traditions (and cases of hybridization between them).

That being said, the numerous innovations specific to the Georgian textual tradition, all of which are already present in JG2, point to the existence of a version that would have predated the common ancestor of the Georgian manuscripts. A possible *terminus post quem* for the original written version of the PDM can be postulated on the basis of the codex Oxford, Bodleian Library, Georg. b. 1, which contains a menologion accompanied by hagiographic texts, including the passion of St. George and four miracle narratives; but neither the miracle of the dragon nor that of the demon appears in this collection.⁴¹ The codex was written in the years 1038–1040 at the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, that is, the same institution where the JG2 was copied. This original manuscript version of the PDM, then, more than likely dates to some time after 1040.

By the end of the twelfth century, the textual history of the PDM had been sufficiently active to give rise to the diversity—in three languages—represented by our earliest Georgian manuscript (JG2); three Latin manuscripts (AA, BB, and CC); and the earliest surviving Greek witness (Z: Vatican, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 46). Z already shows the effects of all four innovations presented in Table 3, as well as having lost numerous features common to the Georgian and early Latin manuscripts. It has also added some new materials (e.g., after the invocation of God “who sits above the cherubim” in section 36, it adds “and above the seraphim” [καὶ

Dionysius the Areopagite: A Medieval Translation from Georgian into Latin,” *AB* 140 (2022): 67–89.

41 P. Peeters, “De codice hiberico bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis,” *AB* 31 (1912): 301–18; and D. Barrett, *Catalogue of the Wardrop Collection and of other Georgian Books and Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1973). The miracles correspond to the first four in J. Aufhauser, *Miracula S. Georgii* (Leipzig, 1913), 2–43: the widow’s pillar, the icon shot with an arrow, the Paphlagonian captive, and the rescue of the son of Leon and Theophania.

ἐπὶ τῶν Σεραφίμ], for which there is no warrant in the biblical source [Daniel 3:55]).

There is as yet no evidence that the PDM existed in languages other than Georgian before the beginning of the Crusades. What is important is that the production of JG2 at the Monastery of the Holy Cross proves that a version of the PDM existed in Jerusalem on the eve of its conquest by the crusaders in 1099. The Holy City in the twelfth century would have been the ideal milieu for the initial phase of exchange among the Georgian, Greek, and Latin ecclesiastical circles from which the earliest Greek and Latin recensions of the PDM emerged. Evidence for this interchange comes from the Monastery of the Holy Cross itself, which was visited on several occasions by West European Christians in the course of the twelfth century. The names of dignitaries such as preceptor Geoffroy Foulcher and Grand Master Philip of Nablus of the Knights Templar, transcribed with varying degrees of accuracy in Georgian script, have been identified in prayer requests noted in the manuscript Jerusalem, Monastery of the Holy Cross, H-1661 (dated 1156).⁴²

In addition to being a venue in which Western Christians lived in proximity to Greek and Georgian monks, the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and the other states founded in the Levant by crusaders were centers of the propagation of the cult of St. George. Even before taking Jerusalem, the crusaders considered St. George one of their patrons and protectors, and visions of George, accompanied by other military saints, and leading a host of heavenly soldiers, were reported during the sieges of Antioch in 1098 and Jerusalem the following year.⁴³ Indications of Crusader interest in the representation of St. George as a dragon fighter

include coins issued at Antioch in the years 1112–1119 by Roger of Sicily, featuring the image of George spearing a dragon.⁴⁴ The reputation of St. George as patron of Christian warriors, with its associated stories and images (including the PDM), spread westward as soldiers returned to Europe from the Holy Land. Among them were the Knights Templar, who had an image of George defending a woman from a dragon painted alongside battle scenes from the Crusades on a late twelfth-century fresco in the chapel of their commandery in Cressac, France.⁴⁵

The popularity of St. George among not only Georgians but among Latin and Greek Christians, and the unique cultural milieu of Jerusalem in the twelfth century, explains the rapid copying and emergence of variants—and why none of the extant manuscripts, old as they are, precisely reflect the original composition. Instead, the original PDM narrative emerges only when viewing the Georgian tradition (particularly the very old JG2), the older Latin recensions, and certain Greek witnesses against the other versions in the corpus.

Concluding Remarks

In Johannes Aufhauser's 1911 study of the Greek and Latin recensions of the PDM, the oldest Greek version (Z) was selected as the basis for his edition.⁴⁶ At that time, the Georgian versions of the PDM were unknown outside of the Russian Empire, and the Latin versions AA and BB would only be published two years later.⁴⁷ The addition of these sources, plus two unpublished Greek manuscripts (Ξ and Ψ),⁴⁸ casts a very different light on our oldest Greek testimony, which now appears to be the outlier among the earliest witnesses of the PDM, marked by numerous omissions and innovations.

42 L. Menabde, *Dzveli kartuli mc'erlobis k'erebi*, vol. 2, *Dzveli kartuli mc'erlobis k'erebi sazyuargaret* (Tbilisi, 1980), 94–95; M. Tsurtsumia, "Commemorations of Crusaders in the Manuscripts of the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem," *JMedHist* 38.3 (2012): 318–34; and T. Otkhmezuri, ed., M. Odisheli and M. Vickers, trans., *Medieval Georgian Literary Culture and Book Production in the Christian Middle East and Byzantium* (Münster, 2022), 450–51.

43 S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, *The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1951), 248; C. Sweetenham, trans., *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: "Historia Iherosolimitana"* (New York, 2005), 54, 142, 171; and F. De Vriendt, "Les interventions miraculeuses de saint Georges dans les batailles au Moyen Âge," in *Saint Georges et le dragon: Genèse et génération de récits*, ed. M. Ballez, J.-L. Depotte, and B. Kanabus (Louvain, 2018), 43–53.

44 Kuehn, *Dragon*, 99.

45 É. Biais, "Les fresques du Temple, près de Blanzac (Charente)," *Réunion des Sociétés des beaux-arts des départements* 25 (1901): 346–53, at 349.

46 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*.

47 Huber, *Johannes Monachus*.

48 Aufhauser knew about the Ξ version, but was unable to see it due to an earthquake in Sicily that seriously damaged the library where it was held (Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 31).

Further work on the narratives associated with the PDM in the manuscript tradition might shed additional light on its compositional history. Among the topics awaiting further investigation is, in particular, the relation between the PDM and the demon miracle.⁴⁹ In the two Georgian manuscripts under consideration here (JG₂ and JG₃₇), several of the Latin manuscripts (AA, CC, and DD), and the large majority of the Greek versions in the corpus (A, F, H, K, U, W, Z, Φ, Π, Θ, Ψ, Ξ, Γ, and Δ), the PDM is followed by another miracle narrative: Shortly after leaving the city of Lasia, George encounters a demon of humble appearance, who reveals himself to be a powerful devil who was present at the creation of the world. George immobilizes him with the sign of the cross, and throws him back into the fires of hell. The texts of the PDM and demon miracle in Latin manuscript AA in particular are both very close to the Georgian tradition, and the group comprising the Latin manuscripts CC and DD share innovations in their versions of both miracles. I hope to return to comparison of early versions of the demon miracle in future work.

I will conclude this study with some preliminary remarks on pictorial representations of the PDM in frescoes, icons, and other media, which also point to a Georgian milieu as the place of origin of the PDM. Depictions of warrior saints, including St. George, spearing a serpent-like dragon are attested in Georgia by the sixth to seventh century.⁵⁰ By the tenth century, a new representation of St. George made its appearance in Georgia and Armenia. George continued to be depicted on horseback with spear in hand, but instead of a dragon, his weapon pierces a human figure, often labeled as the emperor Diocletian. Often, George and his human adversary are juxtaposed to

St. Theodore spearing a dragon.⁵¹ Several churches in western Georgia feature paired images of George and Theodore (and their respective victims) above the church entrance and sometimes the eastern window opening into the sanctuary, as though guarding the sacred space within.⁵²

Visual representations that can be unambiguously associated with the PDM began to appear around 1100.⁵³ One image in particular (Fig. 1) came to stand for the narrative as a whole: the scene where the princess leads the subdued dragon into the city.

As noted by Privalova, the earliest depictions of the dragon-on-leash scene are on Georgian territory, dated to the late eleventh to early twelfth century.⁵⁴ From the outset, there emerged a canonical iconography, which continued to be replicated in Georgia and elsewhere up to the seventeenth century. Four particularly stable iconographic features are:

1. The princess is shown, usually in the foreground, leading the dragon on a leash held in her right hand while she makes an open-palmed gesture toward the right with her left hand.

51 Early examples include the early tenth-century Armenian church at Aght'amar (S. Der Nersessian, *Aght'amar: Church of the Holy Cross* [Cambridge, MA, 1965], 19) and a triptych icon from St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai, said to have been "produced under Georgian influence" in the ninth to tenth century (Weitzmann, *The Icon*, 57). Twin depictions of George and another warrior saint, usually Theodore, are attested outside of Transcaucasia, e.g., at Amaseia in Anatolia and Vinica in Macedonia, but in these images both saints are killing the same adversary, either a serpent or a man (Grotowski, *Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints*, figs. 7, 84).

52 Z. Sxirt'ladze, "Mravaldzalis c'm. giorgis ek'lesia," *Dzeglis megobari* 60 (1982): 40–49; G. Maisuradze, "Der heilige Georg – Ein Held christlicher politischer Theologie," in *Märtyrer-Porträts: Von Opfertod, Blutzügen und heiligen Krieger*, ed. S. Weigel (Munich, 2007), 95–99; P. Buxrashvili, *C'minda giorgi, didebis mxedari* (Tbilisi, 2014); and T. Dadiani, "K'idev ertxel nik'orc'mindis reliepebis šesaxeb," *Sakartvelos sidzveleni* 22 (2019): 95–112.

53 It is worth noting that the PDM imagery did not displace the older depiction of St. George spearing Diocletian. On the outer wall of the Adishi church containing the earliest fresco of the PDM is a painting of George and Theodore on horseback, spearing a man and a serpent, respectively: A. Volskaia, "K'edlis mxat'vroba sop. adišis c'm. giorgis ek'lesiaši," *Dzeglis megobari* 19 (1969): 53–58.

54 Privalova, *Pavnisi*.

49 BHG 687k; Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*; Tomea, "San Giorgio in Crimea"; and Tuite, *Old Georgian Version*.

50 Walter, "Origins of the Cult of St. George"; C. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (Aldershot, 2003); T. Dadiani, "C'minda mxedrebi ik'onograpia adreuli šua sauk'unc'ebis kartul reliepebi, VI–VIII ss.," *Sakartvelos sidzveleni* 12 (2008): 316–37; and N. Iamanidze, "The Dragon-Slayer Horseman from Its Origins to the Seljuks: Missing Georgian Archaeological Evidence," in *Der Doppeladler: Byzanz und die Seldschuken in Anatolien vom späten 11. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. N. Asutay-Effenberger and F. Daim (Mainz, 2014), 97–110.



Fig. 1. Church of St. George, Adishi, Georgia. Fresco depicting the princess leading the dragon. Photo by the author.

2. George rides behind her on a white horse, his cape billowing behind him, holding a spear, but not attacking the dragon.
3. The dragon, with a leash around its neck, follows the princess.
4. The walled city, with people looking out from its ramparts, is shown on the right margin.

While some of these elements are dictated by the content of the PDM narrative, others are associated with the standard iconography of St. George (the white horse and cape), and yet others seem to have emerged as conventions specific to the iconography of this scene, such as the princess gesturing with her left hand.

In Table 4 are listed the canonical depictions of the dragon-on-leash scene that are known to me at

present. The numbers in parentheses refer to the four features just mentioned.⁵⁵

55 The references are abbreviated as follows: AT = G. Atanasov, *Sveti Georgi Pobedonosiec: Kult i obraz v pravoslavniia iztok prez srednovekovieto* (Veliko Tarnovo, 2001); CHUB = Chubinashvili, *Gruzinskoe čekannoie iskusstvo*; GED = E. Gedevanishvili, "Cult and Image of St. George in Medieval Georgian Art," in *Cultural Interactions in Medieval Georgia*, ed. M. Bacci, T. Kaffenberger, and M. Studer-Karlen (Wiesbaden, 2018), 143–68; PRV = Privalova, *Pavnisi*; MW = T. Mark-Weiner, "Narrative Cycles of the Life of St. George in Byzantine Art" (PhD diss., New York University, 1977); WE = Weitzmann, *The Icon*; and XU = L. Z. Xusk'ivadze, *Gruzinskie emali* (Tbilisi, 1981). See also N. J. Chuksin, "Maloizvestnye ikony: Čudo Georgija o zmie," *Samizdat*, 6 December 2012, http://samlib.ru/c/chuksin_n_j/icons_11.shtml; L. M. Evseeva, "Moskovskoe žitijnye ikony Georgija Velikomučenika i ix literaturnye istočniki," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 38 (1985): 86–100; H. Krohm

Table 4. Canonical Depictions of the Scene of the Princess Leading the Dragon from the PDM

Site	Date (or Century)	Description	References
Adishi, Georgia	end of the eleventh to the early twelfth century	(1–4); footless dragon (DR)	PRV
Ik'vi, Georgia	end of the eleventh to the early twelfth century	(1–4); footless DR w/ horns and beard	PRV; MW
Boč'orma, Georgia	end of the eleventh to the early twelfth century	[fragmentary]	PRV; MW
Pavnisi, Georgia	1170–1180	(1–4); footless, curled DR	PRV; MW
Sinai, Egypt	twelfth to the early thirteenth century (icon)	(1–4); princess's (PR) hands not shown; DR footless?	MW; WE
Ladoga, Russia	1170s–1180s	(1–4); two-footed DR	MW; Salko
K'ldemaghala, Georgia	twelfth century	(1–4); footless, curled DR, w/ horns? (reproduction of lost original)	GED
Vani, Georgia	end of the twelfth to the early thirteenth century	[fragmentary]	PRV
Maghalaant, Georgia	thirteenth century	[fragmentary]	GED
Ač'i, Georgia	thirteenth century	(1–4); DR w/ horns	PRV
Novgorod, Russia	fourteenth century (icon)	(1–4); two-footed, winged DR	AT
Novgorod, Russia	fourteenth century (icon); similar to the other Novgorod icon	(1–4); two-footed, winged, horned DR	AT
Komitades, Greece	1313	(1–4); footless DR	MW
Staro-Nagorichino, North Macedonia	1316	(1–4); two-footed, winged, horned DR	MW; AT
Anydri, Greece	1323	(1–4); horned DR feet not shown	MW
Dečani, Kosovo	1335–1350	(1–4); two-footed, winged, horned DR; very close to Staro-Nagorichino; same dress on PR	MW; AT
Longanikos, Greece	1375–1376	(1–4); footless DR	MW
Ughvali, Georgia	fifteenth century	(1–4); PR on left, still holds leash with right hand; footless DR; George on right	
Georgia	ca. fifteenth century (enamel icon)	(1–3); two-footed DR; no citadel	XU
Grosskmehlen, Germany	ca. 1510, from Antwerp	(1–4); four-footed, winged DR (wood altarpiece)	Krohm and Buczynski
Čxari, Georgia	sixteenth century (Sadgeris jvari [Sadgeri Cross])	(1–3); close to earliest Georgian frescoes: footless DR, but no city	
Goris Jvari, Georgia	sixteenth century	(1–4); four-footed DR?	CHUB
Moscow, Russia	early sixteenth century	(1–4); two-footed, winged, horned DR	Evseeva
Vologda, Russia	second half of the sixteenth century	(1–4); two-footed, winged, horned DR	Chuksin
Xoni, Georgia	1636	(1–3); copied from enamel icon? Two-footed DR; no citadel	XU; CHUB

As the PDM narrative and its imagery spread beyond the borders of Georgia, the most noticeable alterations in the iconography concerned the dragon. Initially depicted like a serpent, sometimes with horns or a beard, it is shown with two front legs and wings in twelfth- to fourteenth-century Russian and Balkan representations, then with four legs in some late depictions.⁵⁶

It appears, therefore, that not only were the earliest textual and pictorial manifestations of the PDM associated with the Georgian ecclesiastical milieu, but also that both representations soon established themselves as canonical, at least within the Orthodox Christian world. By the fourteenth century, as the popularity of the *Legenda aurea* increased, depictions of the PDM in books of hours and paintings spread throughout Western Europe. But as the PDM traversed time and space, certain features of the portrayal of the defeat of the dragon underwent change. In the earliest depictions, such as the frescoes at Adishi (shown above) and Ik'vi in Georgia, the princess is placed in the foreground and is at least as prominent as St. George, if not more so. With the passage of time, the image of George becomes more central, and often proportionally larger, whereas that of the princess is set off to the side and usually drawn smaller.

Even more significant is the alteration in the role of George in this scene. According to the canonical versions of the PDM, George subdues the dragon with the sign of the cross and a prayer. His only violent interaction with it comes at the end, when he beheads it with his sword. From the thirteenth century onward, depictions appeared in which George spears the dragon in the head or mouth, while the princess stands or kneels

at the side, sometimes holding a leash attached to the dragon.⁵⁷ Portrayals of the PDM in which George is shown attacking the dragon became dominant in West European iconography,⁵⁸ and they were also more frequent in Eastern Europe, including Georgia.⁵⁹ Doubtless contributing to the popularity of the newer type of portrayal is the text of the LA, according to which George wounds the dragon with his lance before turning it over to the princess, an innovation with respect to earlier versions of the PDM.⁶⁰ I believe there is an interesting story to be told about how this change in iconographic practice came to pass, but that is best done at another time and place.

Department of Anthropology
Pavillon Lionel-Groulx
3150 Jean-Brillant
Montréal QC H3T 1N8
Canada
kj.tuite@umontreal.ca

and B. Buczynski, "Retables brabançons inconnus conservés en Allemagne: Les retables anversoires de l'église de Grosskmehlen," in *Retables brabançons des XIV^e et XV^e siècles: Actes du colloque organisé par le Musée du Louvre les 18 et 19 mai 2001*, ed. S. Guillot de Suduiraut (Paris, 2002), 541–78; and N. Salko, *Živopis' drevnej Rusi: Mozaiki, freski, ikony* (Leningrad, 1982).

56 Cf. the chronology of dragon imagery in Europe in Ogden, *Dragon in the West*.

57 E.g., S. Riches, *St George: Hero, Martyr and Myth* (Stroud, 2000), 5, 64, 74, 83, 94.

58 The one exception I know of in West European portrayals of the PDM is a depiction of the princess leading a four-footed dragon into the city, on an altarpiece made in Antwerp and now in Grosskmehlen, Germany, dated to ca. 1510 (Krohm and Buczynski, "Retables brabançons").

59 E. K'vač'atadze, "C'm. giorgis reliepi niabidan," in *International Conference on Culture and Art: Research and Management; Conference Materials* (Batumi, 2015), 15–20. An eighteenth-century Russian manual for icon painters specifies that in depictions of the PDM, St. George, seated on a white horse, spears the dragon in the mouth, while the princess holds it on a leash made from her belt (G. Filimonov, *Svodnyj ikonopisnoj podlinnik XVIII veka* [Moscow, 1874], 327–28).

60 LA: *et lanceam fortiter vibrans et se deo commendans ipsum fortiter vulneravit et ad terram deiecit*. In the sets of images from the vita of St. George in Jindřichův Hradec, dated 1338, and the so-called Hippolyt-Altar (Cologne, fourteenth century), George is first shown spearing the dragon, followed by a depiction of the princess leading it with her belt while George follows on horseback (Aufhäuser *Drachenwunder*, 233–34; and V. Kretschmar, "Der sogenannte Hippolyt-Altar im Museum Wallraf-Richartz in Köln," *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 4 [1883]: 93–104).

✂ THIS PAPER WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE without the assistance of Catherine Louis and Matthieu Cassin, of the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, and Xavier Lequeux and François De Vriendt,

of the Société des Bollandistes. I wish to thank all four of them for their hospitality during my visits to their respective institutes in February 2022. Special thanks go to Mme. Louis, for help locating the microfiches of the

manuscripts Ψ, Π, and Θ, and for operating the viewing equipment, and of course to M. Lequeux, whose deep knowledge of Byzantine Greek language and literature unlocked information in nearly unreadable documents that I could have never found on my own. Thanks also go to Jost Gippert, Mariam Kamarauli, Colin Whiting, Igor Dorfmann-Lazarev, Daniel Ogden, and Stephen Rapp for their helpful comments and responses to my queries at various stages during the writing of this text; my research assistant, Amédé Servanin-Monastesse; and two anonymous reviewers.

I express my gratitude to the staff members of the following libraries, which generously provided me with

digital copies of Greek manuscripts: the Department of Manuscripts and Facsimiles of the National Library of Greece (manuscripts Athens 278, 346, 363 and 838); the Biblioteca Regional Universitaria Giacomo Longo di Messina (S. Salv. Gr 29); and the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice (manuscripts Gr II 42, Gr II 160, Gr VII 38). An abridged, preliminary version of this paper was read at the International Medieval Congress (IMC) at the University of Leeds, 5 July 2023. I would like to thank the participants on the “Entangled Caucasus” panel at the IMC, especially James Baillie, Nicholas Evans, and Cassandre Lejosne.

Appendix

Part 1: Corpus of Georgian, Latin, and Greek Recensions of the PDM

Old Georgian Texts

- (a) JG₂ (Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchal Library, Georg. 2). The principal Georgian text in this corpus is the eleventh-century version contained in the codex JG₂ (PDM on folios 239r–41r; demon miracle on folios 241r–41v). The codex and its contents have been described by Cagareli (“Pamjatniki gruzinskoj stariny,” 172), Marr (*Žitie Sv. Grigorija Xandztijskago*, xxxviii–lxx), and Blake (“Catalogue,” 357–62). A photographic reproduction is available at the website of the US Library of Congress (<https://www.loc.gov/resource/amedmonastery.00271072235-j0/>).¹
- (b) JG₃₇ (Jerusalem, Greek Patriarchate, Georg. 37), a collection of hagiographic texts and homilies that, according to Blake (“Catalogue,” 194–98), was copied between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. The PDM is on folios 185v–87r, followed by the demon miracle (folios 187r–87v). This codex can also be viewed on the Library of Congress website (<https://www.loc.gov/resource/amedmonastery.00271072533-j0/>). The text contains a few minor morphological changes, including the spelling of the vowel /e/ with the letter *Ვ* ([ē], which in earlier Georgian represented the diphthong /ey/), whenever it follows the glide /w/ (written [oü]).² On the other hand, JG₃₇ conserves several archaisms of JG₂ that had undergone alteration in the other witnesses, including the verb forms *მიუქცია* (turned to stop at [a place]) and *დამამორჩილე* (make it submit to me).³ Some of these archaisms

turn up in a versified rendering of the PDM by an eighteenth-century author, which seems to have been based on JG₃₇ or a document closely related to it.⁴

The texts in JG₂ and JG₃₇ are written in the minuscule script known as ნუსხური, which began to supplant the older ასომთავრული majuscule script in the ninth century, and remained in use until recently for ecclesiastical documents. One notable characteristic of medieval Georgian writing is the frequent use of abbreviations, indicated by a tilde-like mark (ქარაგმა) placed over the spot where letters were omitted. Abbreviations are used for *nomina sacra*, as in Greek, but also for nouns and verbs of all types. Certain word categories, such as postpositions and pronouns, are almost always abbreviated. For example, the first sentence of section 31 in JG₃₇ (see below, Table 6) employs *karagmas* in almost every word:

31 მ ~ყნ რ ~ქე ქომ ~ნ მ ~ნ ო ~დ ა ~ა ო ~მა ოს ოს
ქ ~ოქ ოს ოს

m(a)š(i)n h(r)k(u)a kalm(a)n m(a)n v(itarme)d
o(üpal)o č(e)mo ese ars k(a)l(a)ki lasiay.

“Then the maiden said to him: Lord, this is the city Lasia.”

- (c) For his collection of Old Georgian hagiographies, S. Qubaneišvili collated the PDM texts from three manuscripts dated to the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries (Q–762, folios 295r–98v; H–600, folios 86r–89v; and H–1760, folios 193r–94r).⁵ All three manuscripts are now in the collection of the Georgian National Centre of Manuscripts (ხელნაწერთა ეროვნული ცენტრი) in Tbilisi. Qubaneišvili’s edition is available at the TITUS project website (<https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcg/cauc/ageo/gh/ghqub/>

1 The text of the PDM from the JG₂ was recently published, along with a translation and commentary (Tuite, *Old Georgian Version*).

2 For example, the verb root *-čwen-* (show) is written *ჩაუქჩი* [čoučh] [čoučh], with *ჩ* rather than *ე* [e], as in JG₂. The writing of *ჩ* in this context becomes increasingly frequent in later manuscripts (Z. Sarjveladze, *Kartuli salit'erat'uro enis ist'oriis šesavali* [Tbilisi, 1984], 281–82).

3 Tuite, *Old Georgian Version*.

4 Gabidzashvili, *C'minda giorgi*, 339–44.

5 S. Qubaneišvili, *Dzveli kartuli lit'erat'uris krest'omatia*, vol. 1 (Tbilisi, 1946), 320–22.

Table 5. Divergent Readings in Georgian Witnesses of the PDM

Section	JG37, Q'ubaneišvili's Collation	JG2, Sabinin	Greek (U, Ξ, and Ψ)	Latin AA and BB
3	უწყალო და ულმობელ	ულმობელ და უწყალო	μη ἐλεῶν μη δὲ οἰκτεῖραν	<i>sine elemosina et sine omnibus bonis</i>
21	სასწაულები და ნიშები	სასწაულები	σημεῖα καὶ τεράστια	<i>prodigia et signa</i>
37	შეისმა ვედრებად შენი	შეისმინა ჳმად შენი	εἰσηκοσθη ἡ δέησις σου	<i>audita est deprecatio tua</i>

ghqub.htm). See also Gabidzashvili's edition of the PDM based on the manuscripts JG2, Q-762, and H-600.⁶

- (d) The nineteenth-century collection of saints' lives edited by G. Sabinin includes a version of the PDM and the demon miracle from an unspecified source.⁷ The orthography and many lexical choices had been "modernized" according to the usage of late premodern literary Georgian, before the linguistic reforms of the later nineteenth century. The Sabinin version also includes a lengthy addition to the king's lament, intercalated between sections 17 and 18, and a handful of added words and phrases elsewhere in the text.

Although they are spread over several centuries, the earliest Georgian PDM texts resemble each other very closely and form a much tighter cluster than do the Latin or Greek versions. Despite the distinctive characteristics mentioned previously, the Sabinin version as well stands close enough to the others to motivate the postulation of a common ancestor. The differences among the older texts—JG2, JG37, and the three manuscripts collated by Q'ubaneišvili—are very minor, rarely amounting to more than an omitted or added word, or a slight change of morphology or word order. A few divergences can be identified, however, from which one can hypothesize the internal history of the Georgian corpus. The three features shown here are particularly diagnostic, since in each case the passage in JG2 represents what is likely to have been a copying error, as confirmed by the parallel readings in the Greek and Latin corpora (Table 5).

In section 37, the copyist of JG2 replaced the expected ვედრებად (plea) with the word ჳმად (voice), repeated from the preceding line ("there came a voice from above"). The verbs შეისმა and შეისმინა both mean "it was heard," but the former is far rarer, and it is more likely that შეისმა was recopied as შეისმინა than vice versa. The remaining errors are a reversal of word order at section 3 and the omission of two words at section 21. It would appear that JG37 continues certain readings that have been altered or omitted in JG2, and also that the manuscripts Q-762, H-600, and H-1760 belong to this tradition. The Sabinin text, on the other hand, replicates the errors found in JG2, which indicates that Sabinin drew upon a manuscript descended from JG2, rather than the textual tradition represented by the other four sources. From the comparison of the Georgian texts with each other and supporting evidence from the Latin and Greek corpora, an ancestral Georgian text has been reconstructed as shown in the second column in Part 2 of the Appendix. This text is identical to JG2, except for the modifications (adopted from JG37) discussed above.

Latin Texts

The best-known Latin version of the PDM is of course that in the *Legenda aurea* (LA). Less attention has been paid to the Latin renderings of the miracle that predate it. The Latin corpus for this study comprises three twelfth-century texts, the LA, and a manuscript dated ca. 1300.

- (a) AA [Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, lat. 6933, twelfth century]. Believed to have originated in Pisa. PDM on folios 95r-97r, demon miracle on 97r-98r.⁸

6 Gabidzashvili, *C'minda giorgi*, 75-83.

7 G. Sabinin, *Sakartvelos samotxe: Sruli ayč'eray ywac'la da vnebata sakartvelos c'midata* (St. Petersburg, 1882), 59-62.

8 Huber, *Johannes Monachus*, 128-32; Poncelet, *Catalogus*, 196-98; and Tomea, "San Giorgio in Crimea." Viewable online at "Manuscript

- (b) BB [Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, 739 (ex Vindob. lat. 15), twelfth century]. PDM on folios 172r–74v.⁹

The AA and BB texts share several distinctive innovations that permit them to be grouped together. At section 11, the king offers to give his daughter to the dragon after all of his subjects have given their children, so that “we will not be dispersed from our city.” In place of this phrase, AA and BB have “that the dragon leave our city (without damage)” (*et sic dimittat ciuitatem nostrum* [AA]; *forsitan dimittet sine lesione ciuitatem nostrum* [BB]). At section 43, where George tells the townspeople to stand and see God’s salvation, AA and BB have instead “the mercy of almighty God” (*Dei omnipotentis misericordiam*). AA has been chosen as the primary text for this group. The version in BB is considerably longer, with numerous additions not found in AA.

- (c) CC [Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, lat. 14473, twelfth century]. PDM on folios 1–5v, demon miracle on 5v–6v. Greatly expanded, rather prolix version of PDM.¹⁰ Not as close to the Georgian versions as AA and BB.
- (d) DD [Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Archiv. Capit. S. Pietro C129, ca. 1300]. PDM on folios 16v–36r, demon miracle on 36r–41.¹¹

The texts of the PDM in CC and DD are the products of extensive rewriting and elaboration. Some sections have undergone dramatic expansion due to inserted material, whereas others have been reduced or omitted entirely. Despite their considerable differences, CC and DD have some degree of shared ancestry. In both texts, instead of the reference to God showing miracles and wonders through his servant Moses (section 36), one finds the more explicit “who turned the staff of your

servant Moses into a dragon and vice versa a dragon into dry wood,”¹² a somewhat garbled echo of Exodus 7:8–12. There is also evidence of common ancestry underlying the Latin manuscripts as a group, with the possible exception of LA. Section 36 contains a reference to God’s ability to read hearts and minds. Whereas almost all Greek versions add the qualifier “that are vain,” witnesses AA, BB, CC, and DD (but not LA) have in its place the phrase *antequam fiant*, i.e., the Lord knows men’s thoughts before they happen. This addition appears to echo Daniel 13:42,¹³ or another source as yet unidentified.

- (e) LA (*Legenda aurea*), according to Cod. Monac. lat. 13029 [Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek], folios 110–112, dated 1282.¹⁴ During the compilation of his hagiographic anthology, Jacobus de Voragine (ca. 1230–1298), a Dominican friar who was later consecrated archbishop of Genoa, would have doubtless had access to numerous manuscripts that are now lost, at least one of which shared several key features with the Georgian witnesses. The LA version of the PDM is the product of considerable reworking: the omission or shortening of certain sections (notably, the dialogue between the princess and St. George) and the addition of new material.

Greek Texts

The corpus of Greek texts to be compared was drawn in part from the set of twenty-five manuscripts assembled and collated by Aufhauser, of which I have obtained copies of fifteen. The manuscripts from this set are designated by the capital letters A–Z assigned to them by Aufhauser. To these are added the manuscripts that I have labeled Ξ, Ψ, Π, Θ, and Φ. In terms of orthography, some of the manuscripts in the corpus adhere fairly closely to the norms, whereas others betray, to greater or lesser degrees, what Aufhauser characterized as the “schreckliche Verwilderung” of Byzantine Greek spelling as a consequence of the wide-ranging phonetic changes that affected the postclassical language: the neutralization of the pronunciations of η, ι, υ, and the

—Vat.lat.6933,” DigiVatLib, <https://digi.vatlib.it/mss/detail/Vat.lat.6933>.

9 Huber, *Johannes Monachus*, 124–28; and BHL 3396k.

10 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 179–87; and Tomea, “San Giorgio in Crimea.” Viewable online at “Vitae Sanctorum [u.a.]—BSB Clm 14473,” Munich Digitization Center, <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/en/view/bsb00069384>.

11 Rystenko, *Legenda o Sv. Georgii*, 132–45; and Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 218–26. Viewable online at “Manuscript—Arch.Cap.S. Pietro.C.129,” DigiVatLib, <https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSSArch.Cap.S.Pietro.C.129>.

12 *Qui virgam Moisi famuli tui in draconem et vice versa draconem in aridum lignum vertisti.*

13 *Deus aeternae, qui absconditorum es cognitor, qui nosti omnia antequam fiant.*

14 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 195–212.

former diphthongs $\epsilon\iota$ and $\omicron\iota$; the loss of the distinction between $\omicron$ and ω ; frequent omission of the rough-breathing mark; substitution of υ for β ; etc.¹⁵

- (a) Ψ [Meteores, Monastery of the Transfiguration (Metamorphōseōs), 382, fifteenth century]. PDM on folios 152v–55v, fragment of the demon miracle on 155v.¹⁶ I consulted a microfilm reproduction of this manuscript held in the archives of the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes (IRHT), Orléans. These microfilmed images are difficult to work from, due to the poor state of the manuscript—the pages are missing the upper left corner, and a piece on the lower-middle right side—compounded by the poor quality of the photographs. Stains on some pages obscure two or three letters. The edges of the images are very dark, possibly due to inadequate lighting conditions during the photographing of the manuscript. The text breaks off at the bottom of folio 155v, in the third or fourth sentence of the demon miracle. The next folio has a different text, missing the beginning; thus it appears that one or more pages are lost.
- (b) Ξ [Messina, Biblioteca Regional Universitaria Giacomo Longo di Messina, gr. 29, dated 1308]. PDM on folios 20r–20v, demon miracle on 20v–21r.¹⁷ Digitized images of this manuscript were provided by the Biblioteca Regional Universitaria.
- (c) Υ [Athens, National Library of Greece (Ethnikē Bibliothēkē tēs Hellados), 838, sixteenth century], originally held in Malesina, St. George Monastery (Monē Hagíou Geōrgíou Malessinēs en Lokridi), number 11. PDM on folios 192r–95r, demon miracle on 195v–97r.¹⁸ Digitized copies of the relevant folios

were provided by the Department of Manuscripts and Facsimiles of the National Library of Greece. Υ and Ξ are very close. Although older, Ξ contains additions and some gaps, but very few retentions not also found in Υ .

Also consulted are the following witnesses:

- A [Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 770, dated 1315]. PDM on folios 72r–74v, demon miracle on 74v–75v.¹⁹
- F [Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, II 160, sixteenth century].
- G [Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, gr. 1190, dated 1542].²⁰
- H [Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, VII 38, sixteenth century].
- L [Athens, National Library of Greece, 278, fifteenth century]; digital copy provided by the Department of Manuscripts and Facsimiles of the National Library of Greece.
- Z [Vatican, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 46, twelfth century]. PDM on folios 189–91v, demon miracle on 191v.²¹
- Γ [Mt. Athos, Panteleimon, 161, nineteenth century].²²
- Δ [Mt. Athos, Panteleimon, 90, nineteenth century].²³
- Φ [Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, II 42, thirteenth century]. Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 95–96; and Rystencko, *Legenda o Sv. Georgii*.
- Π [Istanbul, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Panaghia 128, fifteenth century].
- Θ [Istanbul, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Theologikē skholē 39, sixteenth century].

Digital copies of manuscripts F, H, and Φ were supplied by the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice, and Π and Θ

15 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 45.

16 A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1937), 767–68; description and list of contents at “IRHT_GR_ARCHIVES_NOTICES_MSS_id_41792,” *IDEAL*, <http://ideal.irht.cnrs.fr/document/819117>.

17 H. Delhaye, “Catalogus codicum hagiographorum graecorum monasterii S. Salvatoris nunc bibliothecae Universitatis Messanensis,” *AB* 23 (1904): 19–75; Krumbacher, *Der heilige Georg*, 250–51; and Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 3:443–50.

18 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 43; and Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 3:770. Description and contents at “IRHT_GR_ARCHIVES_NOTICES_MSS_id_3134,” *IDEAL*, <http://ideal.irht.cnrs.fr/document/819257>.

19 Rystencko, *Legenda o Sv. Georgii*, 9–18; and Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 33. Images of the manuscript at “Grec 770,” Gallica, <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107231766>.

20 Images of the manuscript at “Manuscript—Vat.gr.1190.pt.1,” DigiVatLib, https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1190.pt.1.

21 Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 32–33. Images of the manuscript at “Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, Manoscritti greci, Ang. gr. 46,” Internet Culturale, <https://www.internetculturale.it/jmms/iccviewer/iccui.jsp?id=oai%3Awww.internetculturale.sbn.it%2FTeca%3A20%3ANT0000%3ACNMD%5C%5C0000116784&mode=all&teca=MagTeca+-+ICCU>.

22 Text of the PDM and demon miracle in Aufhauser, *Drachenwunder*, 144–53.

23 Vernacular Greek version of the PDM and demon miracle published by A. V. Rystencko, *Novogrečeskaja obrabotka legendy o Sv. Georgii i drakone* (Odessa, 1909), 17–28.

were consulted at the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes.

Part 2: Reconstruction of the Ancestral Form of the Princess and Dragon Miracle

In column 1, I present a provisional reconstruction of the text of the PDM (Table 6). This urtext would have existed in the second half of the eleventh century, most likely in Old Georgian. It would have been composed in a monastic setting, probably in Jerusalem, by a writer familiar with the scriptures, the hagiographic literature on St. George and other saints (Febronia in particular), and probably also some early examples of secular literature featuring dragon-fighting heroes, such as the medieval Georgian romance *Amiran-Darejaniani*.²⁴

24 Mose Khoneli, *Amiran-Darejaniani: A Cycle of Medieval Georgian Tales Traditionally Ascribed to Mose Khoneli*, trans. R. H. Stevenson (Oxford, 1958).

(col. 1) The reconstructed text of the PDM, translated into English.

(col. 2) The reconstructed ancestral text of the Georgian recensions of the PDM, translated into English. {Curly brackets} enclose the translation of a passage that is considered an innovation of the Georgian tradition.

(col. 3) The Old Georgian text of JG2, transcribed from miniscules into modern script.

(col. 4) The Old Georgian text of JG37. Because it has not previously been published, I include additional details about the text: <Angle brackets> enclose letters omitted in abbreviated spellings.

For both Georgian texts, large initial letters of sections, usually set off in the left margin, are marked in **large bold face**. Also shown are the original punctuation marks, which resemble those used by the eleventh-century translator Ephrem Mtsire: a single dot (მცირე სასუენი [minor pause]), a double dot, and a triple dot (·: [დიდი სასუენი (major pause)]).

Table 6. Reconstruction of the Text of the PDM

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(1) Hear, my brothers, the great miracle which was done by the holy and great martyr George.	(1) Hear, my brothers, the great {and glorious} miracle which was done by the holy and great martyr George.	ისმინეთ ძმანო ჩემნო . საკვრველი დიდი და დიდებული . რომელი იქმნა წმიდისა და დიდებულისა და დიდისა მოწამისა გიორგის მიერ .	ისმინეთ ძმ(ა)ნო ჩ(ე)მნო საკ(ვ)რველი დიდი და დიდ(ე) ბ(უ)ლი : რ(ო)მელი იქმნა წ(მი)დისა და დ(იდ)ებ(უ)ლისა და დიდისა მ(ო)წ(ა)მისა გ(ი)ორგის მ(ი)ერ :
(2) It happened at that time, in a city called Lasia, and in that city was a king with the name Selinos.	(2) It happened at that time, {during the life of St. George while he was shining upon the land, before his martyrdom}, in a city called Lasia, and in that city was a king with the name Selinos.	იყო ჟამთა მათ ვიდრელა ბრწყინვიდა ქვეყანასა ზედა წმიდა იგი პირველ წამებისა მისისა : იყო ქალაქი ერთი რომელსა ეწოდებოდა ლასია . და იყო ქალაქსა მას შინა მეფე სახელით სელინოს .	იყო ჟ(ა)მთა მ(ა)თ ვ(ი)დრ(ე)ლა ბრწყინვიდა ქვე(ყ)ან(ა)სა ზ(ე)დ(ა) წ(მი)და იგი პ(ირ)ველ წ(ა)მ(ე)ბისა მისისა . ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქი ერთი რ(ო)მელსა ეწოდებოდა ლასია : და იყო ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქსა ში(ნ)ა მ(ე)ფე სახელით სელინოს .
(3) And he was wicked and an idol worshiper and an unbeliever, merciless and pitiless toward the believers in Christ.	(3) And he was wicked and an idol worshiper and an unbeliever, merciless and pitiless toward the believers in Christ.	და იყო იგი უკეთურ და კერპთმსახურ და უმჯულო და უღმობელ და უწყალო ქრისტეს მორწმუნეთა მიმართ .	და იყო იგი უკეთურ და კერპთმსახურ . და უსჯულო და უწყალო . და უღმობ(ე)ლ ქ(რ)ისტეს მ(ო)რწმ(უ)ნ(ე)თა მიმ(ა)რთ :

Table 6. (continued)

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(4) And the Lord requited him according to his evil deeds.	(4) And the Lord requited him according to his evil deeds.	და მსგავსად ბოროტთა საქმეთა მისთა მიაგო მას ოკვალმან :	და მსგავსად ბ(ო)რ(ო)ტთა ს(ა)ქმ(ე)თა მისთა მიაგო მ(ა)ს ო(კვალმან)ნ :
(5) For near the city there was a lake filled with much water, like a sea.	(5) For near the city there was a lake filled with much water, like a sea.	რამეთუ მახლობლად ქალაქისა მის იყო ტბად შესაკრებელი წყალთა მრავალთა, ვითარცა ზღუად :	ბ(ოლო) მახლობლად ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქისა მის იყო ტბად . შესაკრებელი წყალთა მრ(ა)ვ(ა)ლთად ვ(ითარცა) ზ(ღუ)ად :
(6) And there appeared an evil dragon in the waters of the lake, and each day it went out and ate the people of the city.	(6) And there appeared an evil dragon in the waters of the lake, and each day it went out {and slaughtered and consumed} and ate them.	და გამოჩნდა ვეშაპი ბოროტი წყალთა მათ შინა ტბისათა და მარადლე განვიდოდა და მოჰსრვიდა და განჰლევდა და შეჰჭამდა მათ .	და გამოჩნდა ვეშაპი ბოროტი წყალთა მ(ა)ტ შ(ინ)ა ტბისათა და მარადლე გ(ა)ნვიდოდა . და მოსრვიდა და გ(ა)ნჰლევდა და შესჭამდა მ(ა)ტ :
(7) And many times the king gathered his soldiers to kill the dragon, and they were unable to, because of its size.	(7) And many times the king gathered his soldiers to kill the dragon, and they were unable to, because it was {ferocious and} large.	და მრავალ გზის შეკრიბა მეფემან მჭედრებად მოკლვად ვეშაპისა მის და ვერ უძლეს რამეთუ იყო იგი მძვინვარე და დიდ :	და მრ(ავ)ალ გზის შეკრიბა მეფემა მჭედრებად მოკლვად ვეშაპისა მის და ვერ უძლეს : რ(ამეთუ) იყო იგი მძვინვარე და დიდ :
(8) Then all of the city gathered, and cried out to the king, and said: What can we do, O king, for our city is a fine dwelling place, and we are perishing wretchedly.	(8) Then all of the city gathered, and cried out to the king, and said: What can we do, O king, for our city is a fine dwelling place, and we are perishing wretchedly.	მაშინ შეკრბა ყოველი იგი ქალაქი. და ჯმობდეს მეფისა მიმართ და იტყოდეს ვითარმედ რად ვყოთ ჰ მეფეო . რამეთუ საყოფელ ქალაქისა ჩუენისად კეთილ არს . და ჩუენ ბოროტად წარვწყმდებით	მ(ა)შ(ინ) შეკრბა ყ(ოველ)ი იგი ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქი და ჯმობდეს მეფისა მიმ(ა)რთ და იტყოდეს ვ(ითარმედ) რად ვყოთ ჰ მეფეო : რ(ამეთუ) საყოფელი ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქისა ჩ(უე)ნისად კეთ(ი)ლ(ა)რს და ჩ(უე)ნ ბ(ო)რ(ო)ტად წარვწყმდებით :
(9) And you, king, do not care about this, nor do you act, as do the kings of all countries.	(9) And you, king, do not care about this, nor do you act, as do the kings of all countries.	და შენ მეფე არა ჰზრუნავ ამისთვის არცა ილუნი ვითარცა მეფენი ყოვლისა ქუეყნისანი :	და შე(ენ) მეფე არა ზრუნ(ა)ვ ამისთვის არცა ილუნი ვ(ითარცა) ა მეფენი ყ(ოვლისა)ნი ქ(უე)ყნისანი
(10) Then the king became pained, and he was more frightened, and said to them:	(10) Then the king became pained, and he was more frightened, and said to them:	მაშინ ტკივნეულ იქმნა მეფე იგი . და უფროჲს-ლა შეეშინა და ჰრქუა მათ :	მაშინ ტკივნეულ იქმნა მეფე იგი და უფრ(ო)ჲსლა შეეშინა და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ტ .
(11) Make a document, and give your children as sacrifices, and when all of yours will be used up, there is my only-begotten daughter, and I too will give her as a sacrifice, like you, and we will not be dispersed from our city.	(11) {Write} a document, and give your children as sacrifices, and when all of yours will be used up, there is my only-begotten daughter, and I too will give her as a sacrifice, like you, and we will not be dispersed from our city.	აღწერეთ ერთი ჯელით წერილი . და მისცენით შვილნი თქუენნი შესაწირავად . და ოდეს დაესრულნენ თქუენ ყოველთანი არს ასული ჩემი მხოლოდ შობილი . მეცა მივსცე იგი შესაწირავად ვითარცა თქუენ და არა განვცკვეთ ქალაქისაგან ჩუენისა :	აღწერეთ ერთი ჯ(ე)ლით წერილი . და მისცენით შვილნი თქ(უე)ნნი შესაწირავად . და ოდეს დაესრულნენ თქ(უე)ნ ყ(ოველ)თ(ა)ნი არს ასული ჩ(ე)მი მხოლოდ შობილი . და მეცა მივსცე იგი შესაწირავად ვ(ითარცა) თქ(უე)ნ : და არა გ(ა)ნვცკვეთ ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქისაგ(ა)ნ ჩ(უე)ნისა :

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(12) His words pleased them all, and one after the other, they began to give their children, until it came to the king.	(12) His words pleased them all, and one after the other, they began to give their children, until it came to the king.	და სთნდა ყოველთა სიტყუად მისი . და იწყო კაცად კაცადმან მიცემად შვილთა თვსთად ვიდრემდის მიიწია მეფისა :	და სთნდა ყ(ოველ)თა სიტყ(უა)დ მისი : და იწყო კ(ა)ც(ა)დ კ(ა)ც(ა)დმ(ა)ნ მიცემად შვილთა თ(კ)სთად ვ(იდრემ)დის მიიწია მეფისა :
(13) Then the king dressed his daughter in royal purple, and adorned her like a bride, and he kissed her, saying with lamentation and tears:	(13) Then the king dressed his daughter in royal purple, and adorned her like a bride, and he {began to} kiss her, saying with lamentation and tears:	ხოლო მეფემან შეჰმოსა ასულსა თვსსა პორფირი სამეფოჲ . და შეამკო იგი ვითარცა სძალი . და იწყო ამბორისყოფად მისა და გოდებით და ცრემლით ეტყოდა :	ხ(ოლო) მეფემ(ა)ნ შეჰმოსა ასულსა თ(ვ)სსა პორფირი სამეფოჲ . და შეამკო იგი ვ(ითარცა) სძალი : და იწყო ამბორისყოფად მისა . და გოდებით და ცრემლით ეტყოდა .
(14) Go my only-begotten, sweet daughter, to be eaten by the dragon.	(14) Go my only-begotten, sweet daughter, to be eaten by the dragon.	წარვედ მხოლოდ შობილო და ტკბილო ასულო ჩემო შესაჭმელად ვეშაპისა .	წარვედ მხ(ო)ლ(ო)დ შობილო და ტკბილო ასულო ჩ(ე)მო . შესაჭმელად ვეშაპისა :
(15) Alas, my dear child, you comforted me and my kingdom, and you were the light of my eyes, and were expecting a wedding and a bridegroom, and behold, you will leave to be eaten by the beast.	(15) Alas, my dear child, {you were the comfort giver and inheritor of my kingdom}, and the light of my eyes, and expecting a wedding and a bridegroom, and behold, you will leave to be eaten by the beast.	ვამე საწადელო შვილო ჩემო შენ იყავ ნუგეშინის მცემელ . და მკვდრ მეფობისა ჩემისა . და სინათლე თუალთა ჩემთა . და მოსალოდებელ ქორწილისა და სიძისა . და აჰა ესერა საჭმლად მჯეცისა წარივლინები .	ვამე საწადელო შვილო ჩ(ე)მო . შ(ე)ნ იყ(ა)ვ ნუგეშინის მცემელ და მკვდრ მეფობისა ჩ(ე)მისა . და სინათლე თ(უა)ლთა ჩ(ე)მთა : და მოსალოდებელ ქორწილისა და სიძისა . და აჰა ესერა საჭმლად მჯეცისა წარივლინები .
(16) Alas, [i] when will I make a wedding? [ii] when will I prepare a bridal chamber for you? [iii] when will I light the lamps? [iv] when will I assemble choral dancers? [v] when will I hear the melodies of the instruments? [vi] when will I mix wine? [vii] when will I invite the hungry with joy? [viii] and when will I see the fruit of your womb?	(16) Alas, [i] what kind of wedding will I make? [ii] or what size bridal-chamber will I prepare for you? [iii–vi] or what instruments and dancers and lamps, and drinkers and banquet-guests, will I make ready for you? Alas, my beloved child, that I will no longer see your face, [vii] nor will I see the fruit of your womb.	ვამე ვითარსა-ლა ქორწილსა აღვასრულებ . ანუ რაბამსა სასძლოსა შეგიმზადებ . გინა ვითართა ორღანოთა და სახიობათა და ლამპართა და მოს[უ]მურთა და მეინაჯეთა აღგიმზადებ . ვამე საწადელო შვილო ჩემო . რამეთუ არღარა სადა ვიხილო პირი შენი . არცა ნაყოფი მუცლისა შენისაჲ .	ვამე ვ(ითა)რსადა ქორწილსა აღვასრულებ . ანუ რაბამსა სასძლოსა შეგიმზადებ . გინა ვ(ითა)რთა ორღანოთა და სახიობათა და ლამპართა და მოსუმურთა და მეინაჯეთა აღგიმზადებ . ვამე საწადელო შვილო ჩ(ე)მო რ(ამეთუ) არღარა სადა ვიხილო პირი შ(ე)ნი . არცა ნ(ა)ყ(ო)ფი მუცლისა შ(ე)ნისაჲ :
(17) Alas, you will take leave of me, without a common [normal, natural] death	(17) Alas, you will take leave of me, without a common death	რამეთუ აჰა ესერა განმეშორები თვნიერ ზოგადისა სიკუდილისა :	რ(ამეთუ) აჰა ესერა გ(ა)ნმეშორები თვნიერ ზოგადისა სიკ(უ)დ(ი)ლისა :

Table 6. (continued)

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(18) He turned and spoke to the people: Take gold and silver, as much as you wish, and with it my kingdom, and set my sweet child free!	(18) He turned and spoke to the people: Take as much gold and silver as you wish, and with it my kingdom, and set my child free!	და მოექცა და ჰრქუა ერსა მას . მიიღეთ რავედენი გნებაჲს ოქროდ და ვეცხლი და მისთანა მეფობადცა ჩემი . და განათავისუფლეთ შვილი ჩემი .	და მიექცა და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა ერსა მ(ა)ს : მიიღეთ რაოდენიცა გნებაჲს ოქროდ და ვეცხლი . და მისთ(ა)ნა მეფობ(ა)დცა ჩ(ე)მი . და გ(ა)ნათავისუფლეთ შვილი ჩ(ე)მი .
(19) And no one heeded him, because he had first instituted the decree, and as he saw the unyieldingness of the people, he released his daughter.	(19) And no one {listened to him, nor} heeded him, because he had first instituted the decree, and as he saw the unyieldingness of the people, he handed over his daughter to them.	და არავინ ისმინა მისი და არცა შეუნდო ამისთვის რამეთუ მას განენესა განჩინებაჲ იგი პირველითგან . და ვითარცა იხილა მიუდრეკელობად ერისად მის მიუბოძა მათ ასული თვისი :	და არავინ ისმინა მისი და არცა შეუნდო . ამისთვის, რ(ა)მეთუ მ(ა)ს გ(ა)ნენესა გ(ა)ნჩინებაჲ იგი პ(ირ)ველითგან : და ვ(ითარ)ცა იხ(ი)ლა მიუდრეკელობად იგი ერისად მის : მიუბოძა მ(ა)თ ასული თვ(ი)სი :
(20) Then the entire people of the city gathered, from the old to the young, to watch the maiden.	(20) Then the entire people of the city gathered, from the old to the young, to watch the maiden.	მაშინ შეკრბა ყოველი იგი ქალაქი დიდითგან ვიდრე მცირემდე მათდა ხილვად ქალისა მის .	მ(ა)შ(ი)ნ შეკრბა ყ(ოველი) იგი ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქი დიდითგ(ა)ნ ვ(ი)დრ(ე) მ(ა)ცირედმდე მ(ა)თდა ხილვად ქალისა მის :
(21) But loving and all-merciful God wished to show miracles and signs through the holy martyr George,	(21) But mankind-loving and all-merciful God wished to show miracles and signs through the holy martyr George,	ხოლო კაცთმოყუარემან და მრავალმოწყალებმან ღმერთმან ინება რათა აჩუენოს სასნაულები წმიდისა მოწამისა გიორგის მიერ	ხ(ოლო) კ(ა)ცთმ(ო)ყ(უ)არემ(ა)ნ და მრ(ა)ვ(ა)ლმ(ო)წყ(ა)ლემ(ა)ნ ღ(მ)ერტმან . ინება რ(ა)თ ა აჩუენოს ს(ა)სნ(ა)ულები და ნიშები წ(მიდ)ისა მ(ო)წ(ა)მისა გ(იორგ)ის მი(ე)რ :
(22) therefore during those days it came to pass that King Diocletian released him from the army.	(22) therefore during those days it came to pass that {God arranged that} King Deoclitian [sic] released him from the army.	ამისთვისცა მათ დღეთა შინა განაგო რათა განუტეოს მწედრობად დეოკლიტიანე [sic] მეფემან	ამისთ(ვ)სცა მ(ა)თ დღეთა შ(ი)ნ ა გ(ა)ნაგო რ(ა)თ ა გ(ა)ნუტეოს მწედრობად დეოკლიტიანე [sic] მეფემ(ა)ნ .
(23) Thus the glorious George was coming toward the land of Cappadocia to his homestead, and by the commission of God, he came to that place, on that day, when the dragon was to kill the woman.	(23) Thus the glorious George was coming toward the land of Cappadocia to his homestead, and by the commission of God, he came to that place, on that day, when the dragon was to {eat and} kill the woman.	ვინადაც მოვიდოდა დიდებული გიორგი კაბადუკიისა სოფლად და თვსად მამულად . და მოლუაწებითა ღმრთისადთა მოიწია მას ადგილსა მას დღესა შინა . რომელსა შინა ეგულებოდა ვეშაჰსა მას შეჭმად ქალისად მის და წარწყმედაჲ :	ვინადაც მოვიდოდა დ(იდე) ბ(უ)ლი გ(იორგ)ი კაბადუკიისა სოფლად და თვსად მამულად : და მოლ(უ)აწებითა ღ(მ)რთისა)თა მოიწია მ(ა)ს ადგილსა : მ(ა)ს დღესა შ(ი)ნ ა რ(ო)მელსა შ(ი)ნ ა ეგულებოდა ვეშაჰსა მ(ა)ს შეჭმად ქალისად მის და წარწყმედაჲ :

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(24) And he turned toward the lake, to let his horse drink water, and found the maiden seated at the edge of the lake, weeping bitterly.	(24) And he turned toward the lake, to let his horse drink water, and found the maiden seated at the edge of the lake, weeping bitterly.	მიუქცია ტბად რაფთამცა ასუა წყალი ჰუნესა თვსსა და პოვა ქალი იგი მჯდომარე კიდესა ტბისსა : და მწარედ მტირალი :	და მიუქცია ტბად რ(აფთ)ამცა ასუა წყალი ჰუნესა თვსსა . და პოვა ქალი იგი მჯდომარე კიდესა ტბისასა და მწარედ მტირალი :
(25) Then the saint said to her: Woman, why do you weep, and why are you sitting at this place?	(25) Then the saint said to her: Woman, why do you weep, and why are you sitting at this place?	და ჰრქუა მას წმიდამან დედაკაცო რაფსა სტირ ანუ რად ჰზი ადგილსა ამას :	და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს წ(მიდამა)ნ : დედაკ(ა)ცო რაფსა სტირ . ანუ რად ზი ადგილსა ამას .
(26) The maiden said: I see you, my lord, handsome and in the bloom of youth, and why did you come here to die?	(26) The maiden {answered him and} said: I see you, my lord, handsome and in the bloom of youth, and why did you come here to die?	მიუგო ქალმან მან და ჰრქუა მას გხედავ შენ ოვფალო ჩემო . ჰაეროვანსა . და შეუნიერსა ჰასაკითა და ვითარ მოხუედ აქა მოსიკუდიდ	მიუგო ქალმ(ა)ნ მ(ა)ნ და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს . გხედავ შე(ე)ნ ო(ვფალო) ჩ(ე)მო ჰაეროვანსა და შეუნიერსა ჰასაკითა : და ვ(ითა)რ მოხუედ აქა მოსიკუდიდ .
(27) Get on your horse, and flee quickly!	(27) {Go from here}, and flee quickly!	წარვედ ამიერ და მოსწრაფედ ივლტოდე .	წარვედ ამიერ და მოსწრაფედ ივლტოდე :
(28) Then the saint said to her: Woman, what are you, and what are those people looking at you?	(28) Then the saint said to her: Woman, what are you, and what are those people looking at you?	ხოლო წმიდამან ჰრქუა მას დედაკაცო რაფ ხარ შენ . ანუ რაფ არს ერი ისი რომელი გხედავს შენ .	ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდამა)ნ ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს : დედაკ(ა)ცო რაფ ხ(ა)რ შე(ე)ნ . ანუ რაფ არს ერი ისი რ(ომელი) გხედავს შე(ე)ნ :
(29) The maiden said: My lord, my story is extensive, and I cannot tell it to you, rather, flee quickly, that you not die wretchedly!	(29) The maiden said: My lord, my story is extensive and long, and I cannot tell it to you, rather, flee quickly, that you not die wretchedly!	ჰრქუა მას ქალმან მან ოვფალო ჩემო მრავალ არს ჰამბავი ჩემი და გრძელ . და ვერ ძალმიც მითხრობად შენდა არამედ მოსწრაფებით ივლტოდე რათა არა ბოროტად მოჰკუდე .	ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მას ქალმან მ(ა)ნ : ო(ვფალო) ჩემო მრავალ არს და გრძელ ჰამბავი ჩ(ე)მი : და ვერ ძალმიც მითხრობად შე(ე)ნდა : ა(რამე)დ მოსწრაფებით ივლტოდე რ(ათა) არა ბ(ო)რ(ო)ტად მოჰკუდე :
(30) The saint said to her: Tell me everything, and I will die with you, and not leave you!	(30) The saint said to her: Tell me everything, and I will die with you, and not leave you!	ჰრქუა მას წმიდამან გიორგი: მითხარ ყოველივე, და შენ თანა მოვკუდე და არა დაგიტეო შენ .	ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს წ(მიდამა)ნ . მითხარ ყ(ოველი)ვე და შე(ე)ნ თ(ანა) მოვკუდე და არა დაგიტეო შე(ე)ნ :
(31) Then the maiden said to him: Lord, this is the city Lasia, and it is a good living place for men, and in the waters there dwells a dragon, that eats the people of this city.	(31) Then the maiden said to him: Lord, this is the city Lasia, and it is a good living place for men, and in the waters there dwells a dragon, that eats the men of this city {and slaughters the people}.	მაშინ ჰრქუა მას . ქალმან მან ვითარმედ ოვფალო ესე არს ქალაქი ლასია . და არს ესე კეთილ საცხოვრებელად კაცთა . და წყალთა ამათ შინა მკვდრ არს ვეშაპი . და შეჰჭამს იგი კაცთა ამის ქალაქისათა და მოსრავს ერსა :	მ(ა)შ(ინ) ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა ქალმ(ა)ნ მ(ა)ნ : ვ(ითარმე)დ ო(ვფალო) ო ჩ(ე)მო ესე არს ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქი ლასია : და არს ესე კ(ე)თ(ი)ლ საცხოვრებელ კ(ა)ცთა . და წყალთა ამათ შ(ინ)ა მკვდრ არს ვეშაპი . და შეჰჭამს იგი კ(ა)ცთა ამის ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქისათა . და მოსრავს ერსა .

Table 6. (continued)

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(32) And I am the only-begotten daughter of the king, and my father gave an order, that all give their children, one after the other, each day, and when they all had been finished there came my father's turn, and he sent me for the dragon to eat. And behold I told you all, go in peace!	(32) And I am the only-begotten daughter of the king, and my father gave an order, that all give their children, one after the other, each day, and when they all had been finished there came my father's turn, and he sent me for the dragon to eat. And behold I told you all, go in peace!	და მე ვარ ასული მეფისაჲ მხოლოდ-შობილი . და ბრძანებაჲ დადვა მამამან ჩემმან რათა მისცემდენ ყოველნი შემდგომითი შემდგომად შვილთა თვსთა დღითი დღედ . და ვითარცა მოესრულნეს ყოველნი . მოვიდა ხუდრი მამისა ჩემისაჲ . და წარმომაველინა მე საჭმლად ვეშაპისა . და აჰა ესერა გითხარ შენ . წარვედ მშვიდობით :	და მე ვარ ასული მეფისაჲ მხოლოდშობილი : და ბრძანებაჲ დადვა მამამ(ა)ნ ჩ(ე)მმ(ა)ნ . რ(ა)თა მისცემდენ ყ(ოველ)ნი შ(ე)მდგომითი შ(ე)მდგომად შვილთა თ(ვ)სთა დღითი დღედ . და ვ(ი)თარ(ე)ცა მოესრულნეს ყ(ოველ)ნი : მოვიდა ხუცდრი მ(ა)მისა ჩ(ე)მისა : და წარმომაველინა მე საჭმლად ვეშაპისა . და აჰა ესერა გითხარ შ(ე)ნ წარვედ მშვიდობით :
(33) When the saint heard this, he told her: From now on, do not be afraid, but tell me: your father and all those with him, which god do they serve?	(33) When the saint heard this, he told her: From now on, do not be afraid {nor tremble}, but tell me: your father and all those with him, which god do they serve?	ესმა რაჲ ესე წმიდასა ჰრქუა მას ამიერითგან ნულარა გეშინის ნუცა სძრნი არამედ მითხარ მე . მამად შენი და მისთანანი ყოველნი რომელსა ღმერთსა ჰმსახურებენ .	ესმა რაჲ ესე წ(მიდა)სა ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს : ამიერითგ(ა)ნ ნულარა გეშინის ნუცა სძრნი : ა(რამე)დ მითხარ მე : მ(ა)მ(ა)დ შ(ე)ნი და მისთ(ა)ნნი ყ(ოველ)ნი . რ(ომე)ლსა ღ(მერთ)სა ჰმსახურებენ :
(34) The maiden told him: Herakles and Apollo and Skamandros and the great goddess Artemis.	(34) The maiden told him: Herakles and Apollo and Skamandros and the great goddess Artemis.	ჰრქუა მას ქალმან მან . ირაკლის . და აპოლონს . და სკამანდროს (<i>scd</i>) . და დიდსა ღმერთსა არტემის .	ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)ს ქალმან მ(ა)ნ . ირაკლის და აპოლონს . და სკამანდროს . და დიდსა ღ(მერთ)სა არტემის :
(35) Then the saint said to her: Do not fear, but be bold!	(35) Then the saint said to her: Do not fear, but be {fearless and} bold!	ხოლო წმიდამან ჰრქუა ნუ გეშინინ, არამედ უშიშ და კადნიერ იქმენ	ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდამან) ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა : ნუ გეშინინ . ა(რამე)დ უშიშ და კადნიერ იქმენ :
(36a) And St. George raised his eyes toward God and said: God, who sits above the cherubim and looks down to the abyss, you who are and remain the true God,	(36a) And St. George raised his eyes toward God and said: God, who sits above the cherubim and looks down to the abyss, you who are and remain the true God,	და აღიხილნა თუალნი თვსნი წმიდამან გიორგი ღმრთისა მიმართ და თქუა . ღმერთო რომელი ჰზი ქერაბინთა ზედა . და ჰხედავ უფსკრულთა . რომელი ეგე ხარ და ჰგიე ჭეშმარიტი ღმერთი .	და აღიხილნა თ(უ)ალნი თ(ვ)სნი ღ(მრთ)ისა მიმართ წ(მიდამან) გ(იორგი) და თქ(უ)ა : ღ(მერთ)ო რ(ომელი) ჰზი ქ(ე)რ(ა)ბინთა ზ(ე)და . და ჰხედავ უფსკრულთა (<i>scd</i>) . რ(ომელი) ეგე ხ(ა)რ და ჰგიე ჭ(ე)შმარიტი ღ(მერთ)ი :
(36b) you yourself know the heart-thoughts of men,	(36b) you yourself know the heart-thoughts of men,	შენ თავადმან უწყნი გულის ზრახვანი კაცთანი	შ(ე)ნ თ(ა)ვ(ა)დმ(ა)ნ უწყნი გ(უ)ლის ზრახვანი კ(ა)ცთანი

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(36c) you showed mighty miracles and wonders through your servant Moses, show your mercy on me also, and make a good miracle with me. And make this evil beast submit to me beneath my feet, that all will know that you are with me.	(36c) you showed mighty miracles and wonders through your servant Moses, show your mercy on me also, and make a good miracle with me. And make this evil beast submit to me beneath my feet, that all will know that you are with me.	ძალნი აჩუენენ სასწაულნი საკვრველნი . მონისა შენისა მოსეს მიერ . აჩუენე ჩემზედაცა წყალობად შენი : და ყავ ჩემთანა სასწაულ კეთილ და დამამორჩილე ბოროტი ესე მწეცი ქუეშე ფერჯთა ჩემთა : რათა ცნან ყოველთა ვითარმედ ჩემთანა ხარ .	ძ(ა)ლნი აჩუენენ ს(ა)სწ(ა)უა)ლნი საკვრველნი მონისა შ(ენ)ისა მოსეს მ(ი)ერ . აჩუენე ჩ(ე)ნზედაცა წყალობად შ(ენ)ი . და ყავ ჩ(ე)მთ(ან)ა სასწაულ კ(ე)თ(ი)ლ : და დამამორჩილე ბ(ო)რ(ო)ტი ესე მწეცი ქუეშე ფერჯთა ჩემთა : რ(ა)თა ცნან ყ(ოვე)ლთა ვ(ითარმედ) ჩ(ე)მთ(ან)ა ხ(ა)რ :
(37) And there came a voice from above, saying: George, your plea has been heard by the ears of the Lord, do what you wish, for I am with you!	(37) And there came a voice from above, saying: George, your plea has been heard by the ears of the Lord, do what you wish, for I am with you!	და მოიწია ჴმად ზეცით რომელი ეტყოდა . გიორგი შეისმა ჴმად (sic) შენი ყურთა ოვფლისათა, ყავ რადცა გნებავს, რამეთუ მე შენთანა ვარ .	და მოიწია ჴ(მა)დ ზეცით რ(ომელ)ი იტყ(ო)და . გ(იორგ)ი შეისმა ვედრ(ე)ბ(ა)დ შ(ენ)ი ყურთა ო(ვფლ)ისათა : ყავ რადცა გნებავს რ(ამეთუ) მე შ(ე)ნთ(ან)ა ვარ :
(38a) And suddenly the reedbed shook,	(38a) And suddenly the reedbed shook,	და მეყსეულად შეირყია ლერწმონი იგი	და მეყსეულად შეირყია ლერწმონი იგი .
(38b) and the maiden cried out: Alas, my lord, flee from here, behold, the evil dragon comes!	(38b) and the maiden cried out: Alas, my lord, flee from here, behold, the evil dragon comes!	და ჴმა ყო ქალმან მან . ვადმე ოვფალო ჩემო ივლტოდე ამიერ : აჰა ესერა მოვალს ვეშაპი იგი ბოროტი :	და ჴმა ყო ქალმ(ან) მ(ა)ნ . ვადმე ო(ვფალო) ჩ(ე)მო ივლტოდე . ამიერ აჰა ესერა მოვალს ვეშაპი იგი ბოროტი :
(39) But St. George ran to confront the dragon, and he made the sign of the cross over it, and said: Lord, my God, make this beast obedient to me, your servant!	(39) But St. George ran to confront the dragon, and he made the sign of the cross over it, and said: Lord, my God, make this beast obedient to me, your servant!	ხოლო წმიდად გიორგი მირბიოდა შემთხუევად ვეშაპისა მის და გამოსახა მის ზედა სახჴ ჯუარისად და თქუა . ოვფალო ღმერთო ჩემო . გარდააქციე მწეცი ესე მორჩილებად მონისა შენისა :	ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდა)დ იგი მირბიოდა შემთხუევად ვეშაპისა მის . და გამოსახა მის ჴ(ედ)ა სახე ჴ(უარისა)დ და თქ(უ)ა : ო(ვფალო) ო ღ(მერთო) ჩ(ე)მო გარდააქციე მწეცი ესე მორჩილებად მონისა შ(ენ)ისა :
(40) And as he said this, through the aid of the Holy Spirit and the prayer of the saint, the dragon fell at the feet of the saint.	(40) And as he said this, through the aid of the Holy Spirit and the prayer of the saint, the dragon fell at the feet of the saint.	და ვითარცა ესე თქუა შეწევნითა სულისა წმიდისადა და ლოცვითა წმიდისითა . დაეცა ვეშაპი იგი ფერჯთა თანა წმიდისათა :	და ვ(ითარცა) ესე თქ(უ)ა შეწევნითა ს(უ)ლისა წ(მიდ)ისადა . დაეცა ვეშაპი იგი ფერჯთა თ(ან)ა წ(მიდ)ისათა :
(41) Then the saint said to the maiden: Remove your belt, and hand it to me here! And having loosened it, she gave it to him.	(41) Then the saint said to the maiden: Remove your belt, and hand it to me here! And she did so.	ხოლო წმიდამან უბრძანა ქალსა მას . განიჴსენ სარტყელი შენი და მომართუ აქა : და ყო ეგრე .	ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდამა)ნ უბრძანა ქალსა მ(ა)ს . გ(ა)ნიჴსენ სარტყელი შ(ენ)ი და მომართ (sic) აქა : და ყო ეგრე .

Table 6. (continued)

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(42) And [by the commission of God], the saint tied up the dragon, and gave it to the maiden and said: Go toward the city! [And the maiden leading the dragon went to the city]	(42) And the saint tied up the dragon, and gave it to the maiden and said: Go toward the city!	ხოლო წმიდამან შეკრა ვეშაპი იგი და მისცა ქალსა მას და ჰრქუა წარვედ ქალაქით კერძო :	ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდამან) შეკრა ვეშაპი იგი . და მისცა ქალსა მ(ა)ს და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა : წარვედ ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქით კერძო :
(43) When the people saw this wondrous miracle they became afraid, and wished to flee for fear of the dragon, but the saint said to them: Fear not, rather stand and you will see God's deliverance.	(43) When the people saw this wondrous miracle they became afraid, and wished to flee for fear of the dragon, but the saint said to them: Fear not, rather stand and you will see God's deliverance.	იხილა რად ერმან მან სასწაული ესე საკვრველი შეეშინა : და ენაბა (sic) სივლტოლად შიშისათვს ვეშაპისა მის . ხოლო წმიდად იგი ეტყოდა მათ ნუ გეშინინ არამედ დეგით და იხილოთ მაცხოვარებად ღმრთისად	იხილა რად ერმ(ან) მ(ა)ნ ს(ა) სწ(აუ)ლი ესე საკვრველი შეეშინა : და ენება სივლტოლად შიშისათ(ვ)ს ვეშაპისა მის : ხ(ოლო) წ(მიდა)დ იგი ეტყოდა მ(ა)თ ნუ გეშინინ . ა(რამე)დ დეგით და იხილოთ მ(ა)ცხ(ოვ)არ(ე)ბ(ა)დ ღ(მრთისა)დ .
(44) He said to them: Believe in our lord Jesus Christ the all-powerful true God, and I will make this dragon die, and you will not be killed by it.	(44) He said to them: Believe in our lord Jesus Christ the all-powerful true God, and I will make this dragon die, and you will not be killed by it.	და ჰრქუა მათ გრწმენინ ოვფალი ჩუენი იესოჲ ქრისტე ჭეშმარიტი ღმერთი ყოვლად ძლიერი და მოვაკუდინო ვეშაპი ესე, და არა მოიკლნეთ მის მიერ .	და ჰ(რ)ქ(უ)ა მ(ა)თ გრწმენინ ო(ვფალი) ჩ(უე)ნი ი(ესო)ჲ ქ(რისტე) ჭ(ეშმარიტი) ღ(მერთი) ი ყ(ოვლ)ად ძლიერი : და მოვაკუდინო ვეშაპი ესე . და არა მოიკლნეთ ამის მ(ი)ერ :
(45) Then the king cried out, along with his nobles and all the people, saying: Lord, we believe in the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And immediately the saint drew his sword and beheaded it, and gave the maiden to the king.	(45) Then the king cried out, along with his nobles and all the people, saying: Lord, we believe in the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And immediately the saint drew his sword and beheaded it, and gave the maiden to the king.	მაშინ ჳმა ყო მეფემან და დიდებულთა მისთა ყოვლისა ერისათანა . და თქუეს გურწამს ოვფალი მამისა მიმართ და ძისა და სულისა წმიდისა . და მეყსეულად წმიდამან იწადა ჳრმალი თვსი და მოკლა იგი და მისცა ქალი იგი მეფესა :	მ(ა)შ(ი)ნ ჳმა ყო მეფემ(ა)ნ და მო(ა)ც(ა)რთა მისთა : ყ(ოვლ)ისა ერისა თ(ან)ა და თქ(უ)ეს : გურწამს ო(ვფალ)ი მ(ა)მისა მიმ(ა)რთ : და ძისა და ს(უ)ლისა წ(მიდ)ისა : და მეყსეულად წ(მიდამან) იწადა ჳრმალი თ(ვ)სი და მოკლა იგი : და მისცა ქალი იგი მეფესა :
(46) Then the whole multitude of the people gathered and kissed the feet of the saint, and praised God.	(46) Then the whole multitude of the people gathered and kissed the feet of the saint, and praised God.	მაშინ მოკრბა ყოველი სიმრავლე ერისად . და ამბორს უყოფდეს ფერჳთა წმიდისათა და ადიდებდეს ღმერთსა	მ(ა)შ(ი)ნ მოკრბა ყ(ოველ)ი სიმრავლე ერისად : და ამბორს უყოფდეს ფერჳთა წ(მიდ)ისათა და ადიდებდეს ღ(მერთსა) :
(47) Then the saint summoned the bishop Alexander, who baptized the king and the nobles and all the multitude of the people during fifteen days, and he baptized forty-five thousand. And there was great rejoicing in the city.	(47) Then the saint summoned the bishop Alexander, who baptized the king and the nobles and all the multitude of the people during fifteen days, and he baptized forty-five thousand. And there was great rejoicing in the city.	მაშინ წმიდამან მოუწოდა ალექსანდრე ებისკოპოსსა . და ნათელსცა მეფესა და დიდებულთა მისთა და ყოვლისა სიმრავლესა ერისასა ათხუთმეტ დღეს . ხოლო ნათელსცა ორმოც და ხუთსა ათასსა . და იქმნა სიხარული დიდი მას ქალაქსა შინა .	მ(ა)შ(ი)ნ წ(მიდამან) მოუწოდა ალექსანდრე ებისკ(ო)პ(ო)სსა : და ნ(ა)თ(ე)ლსცა მე(ფ)ესა და დიდებულთა მისთა : და ფ(რია)დსა სიმრ(ა)ვლესა ერის(ა)სა ათხუთმეტ დღე : ხ(ოლო) ნ(ათე)ლსცა ორმოც და (ხ)უთ ათ(ა)სსა : და იქმნა სიხ(ა)რ(უ)ლი დიდი მ(ა)ს ქ(ა)ლ(ა)ქსა შ(ინ)ა :

Reconstructed PDM Text	Reconstructed Georgian Text	JG2 (Folios 239r–41r)	JG37 (Folios 185v–87r)
(48) Then the king along with all the people built a holy temple to honor St. George.	(48) Then the king along with all the people built a holy temple {to glorify God and} to honor St. George.	ძაშინ მეფემან ყოვლისა ერისა თანა აღაშენა პატიოსანი ტაძარი სადიდებელად ღმერთსა და პატივად წმიდისა გიორგისა .	ძ(ა)შ(ი)ნ მეფემ(ა)ნ ყ(ოვლ)ისა ერისა თ(ა)ნა : აღაშენა პ(ა)ტ(ი)ოსანი ტაძარი სადიდებელად ღ(მერ)თსა : და პ(ა)ტ(ი)ვად წ(მიდ)ისა გ(იორგ)ისა :
(49) And when they completed the temple, St. George came and showed another wonder, when he entered the temple, and in the church sanctuary, he brought forth a healing spring, which to the present is for healing believers in Christ our God.	(49)) And when they completed the temple, St. George came and showed another wonder, when he entered the temple, and in the church sanctuary, he brought forth a healing spring, which to the present is for healing believers in Christ our God.	და ვითარცა განასრულეს ტაძარი იგი მოვიდა წმიდა გიორგი და აჩვენა სხუად საკვრველებად . რათა შევიდა ტაძარსა მას შინა . და საკურთხეველსა ეკლესიისასა . და აღმოაცენა წყარო კურნებათა და არს იგი ვიდრე აქამომდე საკურნებელად მორწმუნეთა ქრისტეს ღმრთისა ჩუენისათა :	და ვ(ი)თარც(ა) გ(ა)ნასრულეს ტ(ა)ძ(ა)რი იგი . მოვიდა წ(მიდა) გიორგი . და აჩუცნა სხ(უა)დ საკვრ(ვე)ლ(ე)ბ(ა)დ . რ(ა)თა შევიდა ტ(ა)ძ(ა)რსა მას შ(ინ)ა . საკურთხეველსა ეკლესიის(ა)სა : და აღმოაცენა წყარო კურნებ(ა)თ(ა)დ : და არს იგი ვ(ი)დრე აქამომდე საკურნებელად მ(ო)რწმ(უ)ნ(ე)თა ქ(რისტე)ს ღ(მრთ)ისა ჩ(უე)ნისათა :
(50) And the holy martyr George performed many other glorious wonders in the city, through God and the grace He bestowed, in the name of our God Jesus Christ.	(50) And the holy martyr George performed many other glorious wonders in the city, through God and the grace He bestowed, in the name of our God Jesus Christ.	და სხუანი მრავალნი და დიდებულნი საკვრველებანი აღასრულნა წმიდამან მოწამემან გიორგი ღმრთისა მიერ და მისდა მოცემულითა მადლითა მიერ ქალაქსა მას შინა სახელით ღმრთისა ჩუენისა იესოვ ქრისტესთა :	და სხ(უ)ანი მრ(ა)ვ(ა)ლნი დიდ(ებ)ულნი საკვრ(ვე)ლ(ე)ბანი აღასრულნა წ(მიდამა)ნ მ(ო)წ(ა)მემ(ა)ნ გ(იორგ)ი . ღ(მრთ)ისა მ(იე)რ მისდა მოცემულთა მადლითა მ(იე)რ ქალაქსა მ(ა)ს შ(ინ)ა სახელით ღ(მრთ)ისა ჩ(უე)ნისა ი(ესო)ვ ქ(რისტე)სთა :